

Quantum Monte Carlo methods for the solution of the Schrödinger equation for molecular systems

Alán Aspuru-Guzik and William A. Lester, Jr.

1st February 2008

Department of Chemistry, University of California, Berkeley, California
94720-1460

Contents

I	Preface	2
II	Introduction	3
1	Numerical solution of the Schrödinger equation	4
2	Properties of the exact wave function	5
2.0.1	Approximate wave functions	6
III	Algorithms	7
3	Variational Monte Carlo	7
3.1	Formalism	7
3.1.1	The generalized Metropolis algorithm	8
3.1.2	Statistics	10
3.2	Trial wave functions	11
3.3	The variational Monte Carlo algorithm	14
4	Wave function optimization	15
4.0.1	Trial wave function quality	16

5	Projector methods	16
5.0.2	Markov processes and stochastic projection	17
5.0.3	Projection operators or Green's functions	19
5.1	Imaginary propagator	19
5.1.1	Diffusion Monte Carlo stochastic projection	20
5.1.2	The form of the propagator	21
5.2	Importance sampling	22
5.3	Population control	23
5.4	Diffusion Monte Carlo algorithm	24
5.5	Green's function Monte Carlo	26
5.6	Fixed-node approximation	27
5.7	Exact methods	28
5.7.1	The release node method	28
5.7.2	Fermion Monte Carlo	29
5.8	Zero variance principle	31
IV	Special topics	33
6	Fermion Nodes	33
7	Treatment of heavy elements	34
7.1	Effective core potentials	35
7.2	Embedding methods	35
8	Other Properties	36
8.1	Exact wave function and quantities that do not commute with the Hamiltonian	36
8.1.1	Extrapolation method	37
8.1.2	Future walking	37
8.2	Force calculation	38
8.2.1	Correlated sampling	39
8.2.2	Analytic derivative methods	39
8.2.3	Hellman-Feynman derivatives and the zero variance theorem	40
V	List of symbols	51

Part I

Preface

The solution of the time independent Schrödinger equation for molecular systems requires the use of modern computers, because analytic solutions are not available.

This review deals with some of the methods known under the umbrella term quantum Monte Carlo (QMC), specifically those that have been most commonly used for electronic structure. Other applications of QMC are widespread to rotational and vibrational states of molecules, such as the work of [1, 2, 3, 4], condensed matter physics [5, 6], and nuclear physics [7, 8].

QMC methods have several advantages:

- Computer time scales with system size roughly as N^3 , where N is the number of particles of the system. Recent developments have made possible the approach to linear scaling in certain cases.
- Computer memory requirements are small and grow modestly with system size.
- QMC computer codes are significantly smaller and more easily adapted to parallel computers than basis set molecular quantum mechanics codes.
- Basis set truncation errors are absent in the QMC formalism.
- Monte Carlo numerical efficiency can be arbitrarily increased. QMC calculations have an accuracy dependence of $\sqrt{T}$, where T is the computer time. This enables one to choose an accuracy range and readily estimate the computer time needed for performing a calculation of an observable with an acceptable error bar.

The purpose of the present work is to present a description of the commonly used algorithms of QMC for electronic structure and to report some recent developments in the field.

The paper is organized as follows. In Sec. II, we provide a short introduction to the topic, as well as enumerate some properties of wave functions that are useful for QMC applications. In Sec. III we describe commonly used QMC algorithms. In Sec. IV, we briefly introduce some special topics that remain fertile research areas.

Other sources that complement and enrich the topics presented in this chapter are our previous monograph, [9] and the reviews of [10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 6]. There are also chapters on QMC contained in selected computational physics texts [18, 19, 20]. Selected applications of the method are contained in Refs. [21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31].

QMC methods that are not covered in this review are the auxiliary field QMC method [32, 33, 34, 35] and path integral methods [36, 37].

Atomic units are used throughout, the charge of the electron, e and Planck's normalized constant, $\hbar$ are set to unity. In this metric system, the unit distance is the Bohr radius, a_o .

Part II

Introduction

The goal of the quantum Monte Carlo (QMC) method is to solve the Schrödinger equation, which in the time independent representation is given by,

$$\hat{H}\Psi_n(\mathbf{R}) = E_n\Psi_n(\mathbf{R}) \quad (1)$$

Here, $\hat{H}$ is the Hamiltonian operator of the system in state n , with wave function $\Psi_n(\mathbf{R})$ and energy E_n ; $\mathbf{R}$ is a vector that denotes the $3N$ coordinates of the system of N particles (electrons and nuclei), $\mathbf{R} \equiv \{\mathbf{r}_1, \dots, \mathbf{r}_n\}$. For molecular systems, in the absence of electric or magnetic fields, the Hamiltonian has the form $\hat{H} \equiv \hat{T} + \hat{V}$, where $\hat{T}$ is the kinetic energy operator, $\hat{T} \equiv -\frac{1}{2}\nabla_{\mathbf{R}}^2 \equiv -\frac{1}{2}\sum_i \nabla_i^2$, and $\hat{V}$ is the potential energy operator. For atomic and molecular systems $\hat{V}$ is the Coloumb potential between particles of charge q_i , $\hat{V} \equiv \sum_{ij} \frac{q_{ij}}{\mathbf{r}_{ij}}$.

The first suggestion of a Monte Carlo solution of the Schrödinger equation dates back to Enrico Fermi, based on Metropolis, and Ulam [38]. He indicated that a solution to the stationary state equation,

$$-\frac{1}{2}\nabla_{\mathbf{R}}^2\Psi(\mathbf{R}) = E\Psi(\mathbf{R}) - V(\mathbf{R})\Psi(\mathbf{R}) \quad (2)$$

could be obtained by introducing a wave function of the form, $\Psi(\mathbf{R}, \tau) = \Psi(\mathbf{R})e^{-E\tau}$. This yields the equation,

$$\frac{\partial\Psi(\mathbf{R}, \tau)}{\partial\tau} = \frac{1}{2}\nabla^2\Psi(\mathbf{R}, \tau) - V(\mathbf{R})\Psi(\mathbf{R}, \tau) \quad (3)$$

Taking the limit $\tau \rightarrow \infty$, Eq. 2 is recovered. If the second term on the right hand side of Eq. 3 is ignored, the equation is isomorphic with a diffusion equation, which can be simulated by a random walk [39, 40], where random walkers diffuse in a $\mathbf{R}$ -dimensional space. If the first term is ignored, the equation is a first-order kinetics equation with a position dependent rate constant, $V(\mathbf{R})$, which can also be interpreted as a stochastic survival probability. A numerical simulation in which random walkers diffuse through $\mathbf{R}$ -space, reproduce in regions of low potential, and die in regions of high potential leads to a stationary distribution proportional to $\Psi(\mathbf{R})$, from which expectation values can be obtained.

1 Numerical solution of the Schrödinger equation

Most efforts to solve the Schrödinger equation are wave function methods. These approaches rely exclusively on linear combinations of Slater determinants, and include configuration interaction (CI) and the multi-configuration self-consistent field (MCSCF). There are perturbation approaches including the Möller-Plesset

series (MP2, MP4), and coupled cluster (CC) theory, which are presently popular computational procedures. Wave function methods suffer from scaling deficiencies. An exact calculation with a given basis set expansion requires $N!$ computer operations, where N is the the number of basis functions. Competitive methods such as coupled cluster with singles and doubles, and triples perturbation treatment, CCSD(T), scale as N^7 ¹.

A term that we will use later is correlation energy (CE). It is defined as the difference between the exact non-relativistic energy, and the energy of a mean field solution of the Schrödinger equation, the Hartree-Fock method, in the limit of an infinite basis set [44, 45],

$$E_{corr} = E_{exact} - E_{HF}, \quad (4)$$

The CI, MCSCF, MP(N), and CC methods are all directed at generating energies that approach E_{exact} .

Other methods that have been developed include dimensional expansions [46], and the contracted Schrödinger equation method [47]. For an overview of quantum chemistry methods, see Ref. [48].

Since the pioneering work of the late forties to early sixties [38, 49, 50], the MC and related methods have grown in interest. QMC methods have an advantage with system size scaling, in the simplicity of algorithms and in trial wave function forms that can be used.

2 Properties of the exact wave function

The exact time independent wave function solves the eigenvalue equation 1. Some analytic properties of this function are very helpful in the construction of trial functions for QMC methods.

For the present discussion, we are interested in the discrete spectrum of the $\hat{H}$ operator. In most applications the total Schrödinger equation 1 can be represented into an “electronic” Schrödinger equation and a “nuclear” Schrödinger equation based on the large mass difference between electrons and nuclei; This is the Born-Oppenheimer (BO) approximation. Such a representation need not be introduced in QMC but here is the practical benefit of it that the nuclei can be held fixed for electronic motion results in the simplest form of the electronic Schrödinger equation.

The wave function also must satisfy the virial, hypervirial Hellman-Feynman and generalized Hellman-Feynman theorems [51, 52, 53]². The local energy [54],

$$E_L(\mathbf{R}) \equiv \frac{\hat{H}\Psi(\mathbf{R})}{\Psi(\mathbf{R})} \quad (5)$$

¹For a more detailed analysis of the scaling of wave function based methods see, for example, [41] and [42]. For a general overview of these methods, the reader is referred to Chapter I of this book [43].

²The Hellman-Feynman theorem is discussed in Sec. 8.2.3.

is a constant for the exact wave function.

When charged particles meet, there is a singularity in the Coulomb potential. This singularity must be compensated by a singularity in the kinetic energy, which results in a discontinuity in the first derivative, i. e., a *cusps*, in the wave function when two or more particles meet [55, 56]. For one electron coalescing at a nucleus, if we focus in a one electron function or orbital $\phi(\mathbf{r}) = \chi(r)Y_l^m(\theta, \phi)$, where $\chi(r)$ is a radial function, and $Y_l^m(\theta, \phi)$ is a spherical harmonic with angular and magnetic quantum numbers l and m , the electron-nucleus cusp condition is

$$\frac{1}{\eta(r)} \frac{d\eta(r)}{dr} \Big|_{r=0} = -\frac{Z}{l+1}, \quad (6)$$

where $\eta(r)$ is the radial wave function with the leading r dependence factored out, $\eta(r) \equiv \chi(r)/r^m$, and Z is the atomic number of the nucleus.

For electron-electron interactions, the cusp condition takes the form,

$$\frac{1}{\eta_{ij}(r)} \frac{d\eta_{ij}(r)}{dr} \Big|_{r_{ij}=0} = \frac{1}{2(l+1)}, \quad (7)$$

where $\eta_{ij}(r)$ is the r^m factored function for the electron-electron radial distribution function.

Furthermore, $\bar{\rho}(\mathbf{r})$, the spherical average of the electron density, $\rho(\mathbf{r})$ ³, must satisfy another cusp condition, namely,

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial r} \bar{\rho}(r) \Big|_{r=0} = -2Z\bar{\rho}(r) \quad (8)$$

at any nucleus. Another condition on $\rho(\mathbf{r})$ is that asymptotically, it decays exponentially,

$$\rho(r \rightarrow \infty) \approx e^{-2\sqrt{2I_0}r} \quad (9)$$

where I_0 is the first ionization potential. This relation can be derived from consideration of a single electron at large distance. Details on these requirements can be found in refs. [57] and [58].

We discuss how to impose properties of the exact wave function on QMC trial functions in Sec. 5.

2.0.1 Approximate wave functions

James and Coolidge [59] proposed three accuracy tests of a trial wave function, Ψ_T : the root mean square error in Ψ_T ,

$$\delta_\Psi = \left[\int (\Psi_T - \Psi_o)^2 d\mathbf{R} \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad (10)$$

³If N is the number of electrons, then $\rho(r)$ is defined by

$$\rho(r) = N \int |\Psi(\mathbf{R})|^2 d\mathbf{R}$$

the energy error,

$$\delta_E = E(\Psi_T) - E_o \quad (11)$$

and the root mean square local energy deviation,

$$\delta_{E_L} = [\int |(\hat{H} - E_o)\Psi|^2 d\mathbf{R}]^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad (12)$$

where the local energy is defined as in Eq. 5.

The calculation of δ_Ψ by QMC requires sampling the exact wave function, a procedure that will be described in Sec. 8.1.

Several stochastic optimization schemes have been proposed for minimizing expressions 10-12. Most researchers have focused on 12, i.e., minimizing δ_{E_L} ; see, for example, McDowell [60]. In Sec. 4 we turn to stochastic wave function optimization procedures.

Part III

Algorithms

In this section, we describe the computational procedures of QMC methods. All of these methods use MC techniques widely used in other fields, such as operations research, applied statistics, and classical statistical mechanics simulations. Techniques such as importance sampling, correlated sampling and MC optimization are similar in spirit to those described in MC treatises [61, 62, 63, 64, 60, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70]. The reader is referred to the former for more details on the techniques described in this Section.

We present the simple, yet powerful variational Monte Carlo (VMC) method, in which the Metropolis MC ⁴ method is used to sample a known trial function, Ψ_T . We follow with the projector Monte Carlo (PMC) methods that sample the unknown ground state wave function.

3 Variational Monte Carlo

3.1 Formalism

Variational methods involve the calculation of the expectation value of the Hamiltonian operator using a trial wave function, Ψ_T . This function is dependent on a set of parameters, Λ , that are varied to minimize the expectation value, i.e.,

⁴This algorithm is also known as the M(RT)², due to the full list of the authors that contributed to it's development, Metropolis, Rosenbluth, Rosenbluth, Teller and Teller, see ref. [71].

$$\langle \hat{H} \rangle = \frac{\langle \Psi_T | \hat{H} | \Psi_T \rangle}{\langle \Psi_T | \Psi_T \rangle} \equiv E[\Lambda] \geq E_o \quad (13)$$

The expectation value 13 can be sampled from a probability distribution proportional to Ψ_T^2 , and evaluated from the expression,

$$\frac{\int d\mathbf{R} \left[\frac{\hat{H}\Psi_T(\mathbf{R})}{\Psi_T(\mathbf{R})} \right] \Psi_T^2(\mathbf{R})}{\int d\mathbf{R} \Psi_T^2(\mathbf{R})} \equiv \frac{\int d\mathbf{R} E_L \Psi_T^2(\mathbf{R})}{\int d\mathbf{R} \Psi_T^2(\mathbf{R})} \geq E_o, \quad (14)$$

where E_L is the local energy defined in Sec. 2.0.1. The procedure involves sampling random points in $\mathbf{R}$ -space from,

$$\mathcal{P}(\mathbf{R}) \equiv \frac{\Psi_T^2(\mathbf{R})}{\int d\mathbf{R} \Psi_T^2(\mathbf{R})} \quad (15)$$

The advantage of using 15 as the probability density function is that one need not perform the averaging of the numerator and denominator of Eq. 14. The calculation of the ratio of two integrals with the MC method is biased by definition: the average of a quotient is not equal to the quotient of the averages, so this choice of $P(\mathbf{R})$ avoids this problem.

In general, sampling is done using the Metropolis method [71], that is well described in Chapter 3 of [65], and briefly summarized here in Sec. 3.1.1.

Expectation values can be obtained using the VMC method from the following general expressions [72],

$$\langle \hat{O} \rangle \equiv \frac{\int d\mathbf{R} \Psi_T(\mathbf{R})^2 \hat{O}(\mathbf{R})}{\int d\mathbf{R} \Psi_T(\mathbf{R})^2} \cong \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \hat{O}(\mathbf{R}_i), \quad (16)$$

$$\langle \hat{O}_d \rangle \equiv \frac{\int d\mathbf{R} \left[\frac{\hat{O}_d \Psi_T(\mathbf{R})}{\Psi_T(\mathbf{R})} \right] \Psi_T(\mathbf{R})^2}{\int d\mathbf{R} \Psi_T(\mathbf{R})^2} \cong \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\hat{O}_d \Psi_T(\mathbf{R}_i)}{\Psi_T(\mathbf{R}_i)}. \quad (17)$$

Equation 16 is for a coordinate operator, $\hat{O}$, and 17 is preferred for a differential operator, $\hat{O}_d$.

3.1.1 The generalized Metropolis algorithm

The main idea of the Metropolis algorithm is to sample the electronic density, given hereby, $\Psi_T^2(\mathbf{R})$ using fictitious kinetics that in the limit of large simulation time yields the density at equilibrium. A coordinate move is proposed, $\mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}'$, which has the probability of being accepted given by,

$$P(\mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}') = \min \left(1, \frac{T(\mathbf{R}' \rightarrow \mathbf{R}) \Psi_T^2(\mathbf{R}')}{T(\mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}') \Psi_T^2(\mathbf{R})} \right), \quad (18)$$

where $T(\mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}')$ denotes the transition probability for a coordinate move from $\mathbf{R}$ to $\mathbf{R}'$. In the original Metropolis procedure, T was taken to be a uniform

random distribution over a coordinate interval $\Delta\mathbf{R}$. Condition 18 is necessary to satisfy the detailed balance condition,

$$T(\mathbf{R}' \rightarrow \mathbf{R})\Psi_T^2(\mathbf{R}') = T(\mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}')\Psi_T^2(\mathbf{R}) \quad (19)$$

which is necessary for $\Psi_T^2(\mathbf{R})$ to be the equilibrium distribution of the sampling process.

Several improvements to the Metropolis method have been pursued both in classical and in QMC simulations. These improvements involve new transition probability functions and other sampling procedures. See, for example, [73, 74, 75, 76, 5, 77, 72, 78].

A common approach for improving $T(\mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}')$ in VMC, is to use the quantum force,

$$\mathbf{F}_q \equiv \nabla \ln |\Psi_T(\mathbf{R})|^2 \quad (20)$$

as a component of the transition probability. The quantum force can be incorporated by expanding $f(\mathbf{R}, \tau) = |\Psi_T(\mathbf{R})|^2 = e^{-\ln |\Psi_T^2(\mathbf{R})|}$, in a Taylor series in $\ln |\Psi_T^2(\mathbf{R})|$, and truncating at first order,

$$T(\mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}') \approx \frac{1}{N} e^{\lambda \mathbf{F}_q(\mathbf{R}) \cdot (\mathbf{R}' - \mathbf{R})}, \quad (21)$$

where N is a normalization factor, and λ is a parameter fixed for the simulation or optimized in some fashion, for example, see [79]. A usual improvement is to introduce a cutoff in $\Delta\mathbf{R} = (\mathbf{R}' - \mathbf{R})$, so that if the proposed displacement is larger than a predetermined measure, the move is rejected.

A good transition probability should also contain random displacements, so that all of phase space can be sampled. The combination of the desired drift arising from the quantum force of Eq. 21 with a Gaussian random move, gives rise to Langevin fictitious dynamics, namely,

$$\mathbf{R}' \rightarrow \mathbf{R} + \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{F}_q(\mathbf{R}) + \mathcal{G}_{\delta\tau}, \quad (22)$$

where $\mathcal{G}_{\delta\tau}$ is a number sampled from a Gaussian distribution with standard deviation $\delta\tau$. The propagator or transition probability for Eq. 22 is

$$T_L(\mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}') = \frac{1}{\sqrt{4\pi D \delta\tau}^{3N}} e^{-(\mathbf{R}' - \mathbf{R} - \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{F}_q(\mathbf{R})\delta\tau)^2 / 2\delta\tau} \quad (23)$$

which is a drifting Gaussian, spreading in $\delta\tau$. Using Eq. 22 is equivalent to finding the solution of the Fokker-Planck equation [40],

$$\frac{\partial f(\mathbf{R}, \tau)}{\partial \tau} = \frac{1}{2} \nabla \cdot (\nabla - \mathbf{F}_q) f(\mathbf{R}, \tau), \quad (24)$$

Equation 23 has proved to be a simple and effective choice for a VMC transition probability. More refined choices can be made, usually with the goal of increasing acceptance probabilities in regions of rapid change in $|\Psi_T(\mathbf{R})|^2$, such as close to nuclei. For a more detailed discussion of this formalism, the reader

is directed to Chapter 2 of [9]. More elaborate transition rules can be found in [80, 81, 79, 82].

3.1.2 Statistics

Usually, VMC calculations are performed using an ensemble of $N_{\mathcal{W}}$ random walkers, $\mathcal{W} \equiv \{\mathbf{R}_1, \mathbf{R}_2, \dots, \mathbf{R}_n\}$ that are propagated following $T(\mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}')$ using the probability $P(\mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}')$ to accept or reject proposed moves for ensemble members. Statistical averaging has to take into account auto-correlation between moves that arises if the mean square displacement for the ensemble, $\Delta(\mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}')^2/N_{\mathcal{W}}$, is sufficiently large. In such cases, observables measured at the points $\mathbf{R}'$ will be statistically correlated with those evaluated at $\mathbf{R}$. The variance for an observable, $\hat{O}$, measured over N_s MC steps of a random walk is,

$$\sigma_{\hat{O}} \equiv \frac{1}{N_s N_{\mathcal{W}}} (O_i - \langle O \rangle), \quad (25)$$

where $\langle O \rangle$ is the average of the observations, O_i over the sample. A simple approach to remove auto-correlation between samples is to define a number of blocks, N_b , where each block is an average of N_s steps, with variance,

$$\sigma_B \equiv \frac{1}{N_B N_{\mathcal{W}}} (O_b - \langle O \rangle), \quad (26)$$

where O_b is the average number of observations N_t in block b . If N_t is sufficiently large, σ_B is a good estimator of the variance of the observable over the random walk. The auto-correlation time is a good measure of computational efficiency, and is given by

$$T_{corr} = \lim_{N_s \rightarrow \infty} N_s \left(\frac{\sigma_B^2}{\sigma_{\hat{O}}^2} \right) \quad (27)$$

The efficiency of a method depends on time step [83]. Serial correlation between sample points should vanish for an accurate estimator of the variance. For an observable $\langle O \rangle$, the serial correlation coefficient is defined as,

$$\xi_k \equiv \frac{1}{(\langle O^2 \rangle - \langle O \rangle^2)(N - k)} \sum_{i=1}^{N-k} (O_i - \langle O \rangle)(O_{i+k} - \langle O \rangle), \quad (28)$$

where k is the number of MC steps between the points O_i and O_{i+k} . The function 28 decays exponentially with k . The correlation length, L , is defined as the number of steps necessary for ξ_k to decay essentially to zero. For an accurate variance estimator, blocks should be at least L steps long.

The efficiency of a simulation is inversely proportional to ξ_k . The ξ_k dependence on time step is usually strong [9]; the larger the time step, the fewer steps/block L necessary, and the more points available for calculating the global average $\langle O \rangle$. A rule of thumb is to use an $N_t \approx 10$ times larger than the auto-correlation time to insure statistical independence of block averages, and therefore a reliable variance estimate.

The VMC method shares some of the strengths and weaknesses of traditional variational methods: the energy is an upper bound to the true ground state energy. If reasonable trial functions are used, often reliable estimates of properties can be obtained. For quantum MC applications, VMC can be used to obtain valuable results. In chemical applications, VMC is typically used to analyze and generate trial wave functions for PMC.

3.2 Trial wave functions

In contrast to wave function methods, where the wave function is constructed from linear combinations of determinants of orbitals, QMC methods can use arbitrary functional forms for the wave function subject to the requirements in Sec. 2. Because QMC trial wave functions are not restricted to expansions in one-electron functions (orbitals), more compact representations are routinely used. In this section, we review the forms most commonly used for QMC calculations.

Fermion wave functions must be antisymmetric with respect to the exchange of an arbitrary pair of particle coordinates. If they are constructed as the product of N functions of the coordinates, $\phi(r_1, r_2, \dots, r_N)$, the most general wave function can be constructed enforcing explicit permutation,

$$\Psi(\mathbf{R}, \Sigma) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{(N \cdot M)!}} \sum_{n,m} (-1)^n \hat{S}_m \hat{P}_n \phi(r_1, \sigma_1 r_2, \sigma_2, \dots, r_N, \sigma_N), \quad (29)$$

where $\hat{P}_n$ is the n^{th} coordinate permutation operator, $\hat{P}_n \phi(r_1, r_2, \dots, r_i, r_j, \dots, r_N) = \phi(r_1, r_2, \dots, r_j, r_i, \dots, r_N)$, and $\hat{S}_m \phi(\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \sigma_i, \sigma_j, \dots, \sigma_N) = \phi(\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \sigma_j, \sigma_i, \dots, \sigma_N)$ is the m^{th} spin coordinate permutation operator.

If the functions ϕ_i depend only on single-particle coordinates, their antisymmetrized product can be expressed as a Slater determinant,

$$D(\mathbf{R}, \Sigma) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N!}} \det |\phi_1, \dots, \phi_i(r_j, \sigma_j), \dots, \phi_n| \quad (30)$$

Trial wave functions constructed from orbitals scale computationally as N^3 , where N is the system size, compared to $N!$ for the fully antisymmetrized form⁵. The number of evaluations can be reduced by determining which permutations contribute to a particular spin state.

For QMC evaluation of properties that do not depend on spin coordinates, Σ , for a given spin state, the $M!$ configurations that arise from relabeling electrons, need not be evaluated. The reason is that the Hamiltonian of Eq. 1, contains no magnetic or spin operators and spin degrees of freedom remain unchanged. In this case, and for the remainder of this paper, $\sigma_\uparrow$ electrons do not permute

⁵The evaluation of a determinant of size N requires N^2 computer operations. If the one-electron functions scale with system size as well, the scaling becomes N^3 . In contrast, a fully antisymmetrized form requires the explicit evaluation of the $N!$ permutations, making the evaluation of this kind of wave functions in QMC prohibitive for systems of large N .

with $\sigma_{\downarrow}$ electrons, so that the full Slater determinant(s) can be factored into a product of spin-up, $D^{\uparrow}$ and spin-down, $D^{\downarrow}$ determinants. The number of allowed permutations is reduced from $(N_{\uparrow} + N_{\downarrow})!$ to $N_{\uparrow}!N_{\downarrow}!$ [84, 85].

The use of various wave function forms in QMC has been explored by [86], as well as [87]. Fully antisymmetric descriptions of the wave function are more flexible and require fewer parameters than determinants, but their evaluation is inefficient due to the $N!$ scaling.

A good compromise is to use a product wave function of a determinant or linear combination of determinants, e.g., HF, MCSCF, CASSCF, CI, multiplied by a correlation function that is symmetric with respect to particle exchange,

$$\Psi_T = \mathcal{D}\mathcal{F}, \quad (31)$$

Here $\mathcal{D}$ denotes the antisymmetric wave function factor and $\mathcal{F}$ is the symmetric factor. We now describe some of the forms used for $\mathcal{D}$ and then we describe forms for $\mathcal{F}$. Such products are also known as the correlated molecular orbital (CMO) wave function.

In the CMO wave functions, the antisymmetric part of the wave function is constructed as a determinant of independent particle functions, ϕ_i (see Eq. 30). The ϕ_i are usually formed as a linear combination of basis functions centered on atomic centers, $\phi_i = \sum_j c_j \chi_j$. The most commonly used basis functions in traditional *ab initio* quantum chemistry are Gaussian functions, which owe their popularity to ease of integration of molecular integrals. Gaussian basis functions take the form,

$$\chi_G \equiv x^a y^b z^c e^{-\xi \mathbf{r}^2} \quad (32)$$

For QMC applications, it is better to use the Slater-type basis functions,

$$\chi_S \equiv x^a y^b z^c e^{-\xi \mathbf{r}} \quad (33)$$

because they rigorously satisfy the electron-nuclear cusp condition (see Eq. 6), and the asymptotic property of Eq. 9. Nevertheless, in most studies, Gaussian basis functions have been used, and corrections for enforcing the cusp conditions can be made to improve local behavior close to a nucleus. For example, in one approach [88], the region close to a nucleus is described by a Slater-type function, and a polynomial fit is used to connect the Gaussian region to the exponential. This procedure strongly reduces fluctuations of the kinetic energy of these functions, a desirable property for guided VMC and Green's function methods.

The symmetric part of the wave function is usually built as a product of terms explicitly dependent on inter-particle distance, $\mathbf{r}_{ij} = |\mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{r}_j|$. These functions are usually constructed to reproduce the form of the wave function at electron-electron and electron-nucleus cusps. A now familiar form is that proposed by [89, 90, 91], and known as the Jastrow *ansatz*.,

$$\mathcal{F} \equiv e^{U(\mathbf{r}_{ij})} \equiv e^{\prod_{i < j} g_{ij}}, \quad (34)$$

where the correlation function g_{ij} is,

$$g_{ij} \equiv \frac{a_{ij}\mathbf{r}_{ij}}{1 + b_{ij}\mathbf{r}_{ij}} \quad (35)$$

with constants specified to satisfy the cusp conditions,

$$a_{ij} \equiv \begin{cases} \frac{1}{4}, & \text{if } ij \text{ are like spins} \\ \frac{1}{2}, & \text{if } ij \text{ are unlike spins} \\ 1, & \text{if } ij \text{ are electron/nucleus pairs} \end{cases} \quad (36)$$

Electron correlation for parallel spins is taken into account by the Slater determinant.

This simple Slater-Jastrow *ansatz* has a number of desirable properties. First, as stated above, scaling with system size for the evaluation of the trial function is N^3 , where N is the number of particles in the system, the correct cusp conditions are satisfied at two-body coalescence points and the correlation function g_{ij} approaches a constant at large distances, which is the correct behavior as $\mathbf{r}_{ij} \rightarrow \infty$.

In general, the inclusion of 3-body and 4-body correlation terms has been shown to improve wave function quality. The work of [92] shows that if the determinant parameters λ_D are optimized along with the correlation function parameters, λ_C , one finds that the nodal structure of the wave function does not improve noticeably in going from 3- to 4-body correlation terms, which suggests that increasing the number of determinants, N_D is more important than adding fourth- and higher-order correlation terms.

The use of Feynman-Cohen backflow correlations [93], which has been suggested [94] for the inclusion of three body correlations in U , has been used in trial functions for homogeneous systems such as the electron gas [95, 96] and liquid helium [97, 98]. Feynman [93] suggested replacing the orbitals by functions that include hydrodynamic *backflow* effects. His idea was based on the conservation of particle current and the variational principle. The procedure involves replacing mean field orbitals by *backflow*-corrected orbitals of the form,

$$\phi_n(\mathbf{r}_i) \rightarrow \phi_n(\mathbf{r}_i + \sum_{j \neq i} \mathbf{r}_{ij} \nu(\mathbf{r}_{ij})), \quad (37)$$

where $\nu(\mathbf{r}_{ij})$ is the backflow function. Others [99] proposed that $\nu(r_{ij})$ should consist of the difference between the $l = 0$ and $l = 1$ states of an effective two-particle Schrödinger equation. Furthermore, they proposed [100] the inclusion of a $1/r^3$ tail, as originally suggested by Feynman and Cohen,

$$\nu(\mathbf{r}) = \lambda_\nu e^{-\left[\frac{\mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{r}_j}{\omega_\nu}\right]^2} + \frac{\lambda_{\nu'}}{\mathbf{r}^3}, \quad (38)$$

where, λ_ν , $\lambda_{\nu'}$, and ω_ν are variational parameters. As recently noted [95], the incorporation of the full backflow trial function into wave functions involves a

power of N increase in computational expense, but yields a better DMC energy for the electron gas⁶.

Recently, one has seen the practice of taking orbitals from a mean field calculation and the inclusion of averaged backflow terms in the correlation function $\mathcal{F}$. The advantage of this approach is that orbitals are unperturbed and readily obtainable from mean field computer codes.

The correlation function form used by [94] is a selection of certain terms of the general form originally proposed in connection with the transcorrelated method[101],

$$\mathcal{F} = e^{\sum_{I,i < j} U_{Iij}}, \quad (39)$$

where

$$U_{Iij} = \sum_k^{N(I)} \Delta(m_{kI} n_{kI}) c_{kI} (g_{iI}^{m_{kI}} g_{jI}^{n_{kI}} + g_{jI}^{m_{kI}} g_{iI}^{n_{kI}}) g_{ij}^{o_{kI}}. \quad (40)$$

The sum in 39 goes over I nuclei, ij electron pairs, and the sum in Eq. 40 is over the $N(I)$ terms of the correlation function for each nucleus. The parameters m, n and o are integers. The function $\Delta(m, n)$ takes the value 1 when $m \neq n$, and $\frac{1}{2}$ otherwise. The functions g_{ij} are specified by Eq. 35.

This correlation function 39, 40 can be shown to have contributions to averaged backflow effects from the presence of electron-electron-nucleus correlations that correspond to values of m, n and o in Eq. 40 of 2,2,0 and 2,0,2. These contributions recover $\approx 25\%$ or more of the total correlation energy of atomic and molecular systems above that from the simple Jastrow term [94].

3.3 The variational Monte Carlo algorithm

The VMC algorithm is an application of the generalized Metropolis MC method. As in most applications of the method, one needs to insure that the ensemble has achieved equilibrium in the simulation sense. Equilibrium is reached when the ensemble $\mathcal{W}$ is distributed according to $\mathcal{P}(\mathbf{R})$. This is usually achieved by performing a Metropolis random walk and monitoring the trace of the observables of interest. When the trace fluctuates around a mean, it is generally safe to start averaging in order to obtain desired properties.

An implementation of the VMC algorithm follows:

1. Equilibration stage
 - (a) Generate an initial set of random walker positions, $\mathcal{W}_0$; it can be read in from a previous random walk, or generated at random.
 - (b) Perform a loop over N_s steps,

⁶As discussed in Sec. 5.6, an improved fixed-node energy is a consequence of better nodes of the trial wave function, a critically important characteristic for importance sampling functions in QMC methods.

- i. For each r_i of the N_p number of particles,
 - A. Propose a move from $\Psi(\mathbf{R}) \equiv \Psi(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2, \dots, \mathbf{r}_i, \dots, \mathbf{r}_{N_p})$ to $\Psi(\mathbf{R}') \equiv \Psi(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2, \dots, \mathbf{r}'_i, \dots, \mathbf{r}_{N_p})$. Move from $\mathbf{r}$ to $\mathbf{r}'$ according to

$$\mathbf{r}' \leftarrow \mathbf{r} + \mathcal{G}_{\delta\tau} + \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{q}}\delta\tau, \quad (41)$$

where $\mathcal{G}_{\delta\tau}$ is a Gaussian random number with standard deviation $\delta\tau$, which is a proposed step size, and $\mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{q}}$ is the quantum force (see Eq. 21). This is the Langevin dynamics of Eq. 22.

- B. Compute the Metropolis acceptance/rejection probability,

$$P(\mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}') = \min \left(1, \frac{T_L(\mathbf{R}' \rightarrow \mathbf{R})\Psi_T^2(\mathbf{R}')}{T_L(\mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}')\Psi_T^2(\mathbf{R})} \right), \quad (42)$$

where T_L is given by Eq. 23.

- C. Compare $P(\mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}')$ with an uniform random number between 0 and 1, $\mathcal{U}_{[0,1]}$. If $P > \mathcal{U}_{[0,1]}$, accept the move, otherwise, reject it.
 - D. Calculate the contribution to the averages $\frac{\hat{O}_d\Psi_T(\mathbf{R}')}{\Psi_T(\mathbf{R}')}$, and perform blocking statistics as described in Sec. 3.1.2.

- ii. Continue the loop until the desired accuracy is achieved.

4 Wave function optimization

Trial wave functions $\Psi_T(\mathbf{R}, \Lambda)$ for QMC are dependent on variational parameters, $\Lambda = \{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n\}$. Optimization of Λ is a key element for obtaining accurate trial functions. Importance sampling using an optimized trial function increases the efficiency of DMC simulations. There is a direct relationship between trial-function accuracy and the computer time required to calculate accurate expectation values. Some of the parameters λ_i may be fixed by imposing appropriate wave function properties, such as cusp conditions (See Sec. 2).

It is useful to divide Λ into groups distinguished by whether the optimization changes the nodes of the wave function. The Slater determinant parameters, $\lambda_{\mathcal{D}\uparrow\downarrow}$ and the Slater determinant weights, λ_{k_i} change wave function nodal structure [102, 94, 103, 29, 104, 28]. The correlation function parameters, $\lambda_{\mathcal{F}}$ do not change the nodal structure of the overall wave function, and therefore the DMC energy. For some systems, the optimization of $\lambda_{\mathcal{F}}$ is sufficient for building reliable trial functions for PMC methods, because $\mathcal{F}$ is designed in part to satisfy cusp conditions [55, 56, 27].

There have been several optimization methods proposed previously. Some involve the use of analytical derivatives [85, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109], and others focus on the use of a fixed sample for variance minimization Conroy [110], and more recently others [102, 111, 112]. Yet another direction is the use of histogram analysis for optimizing the energy, variance, and molecular geometry

for small systems [113]. In the present study, we concentrate on fixed sample optimization to eliminate stochastic uncertainty during the random walk [111].

Other authors optimize the trial wave function using information obtained from a DMC random walk [114]. This approach shows promise, because usually the orbitals obtained from a mean field theory, such as HF or LDA, are frozen and used in the DMC calculation without re-optimization specifically for correlation effects within the DMC framework.

The common variance functional (VF) [102] is given by

$$VF = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N \left[\frac{\hat{H}\Psi(\mathbf{R}_i, \Lambda)}{\Psi(\mathbf{R}_i, \Lambda)} - E_T \right]^2 w_i}{\sum_{i=1}^N w_i}, \quad (43)$$

where E_T is a trial energy, w_i is a weighting factor defined by

$$w_i(\Lambda) = \frac{\Psi_i^2(\mathbf{R}_i, \Lambda)}{\Psi_i^2(\mathbf{R}_i, \Lambda_0)}, \quad (44)$$

and Λ_0 is an initial set of parameters. The sum in Eq. 43 is over fixed sample configurations.

4.0.1 Trial wave function quality

The overlap of Ψ_T with the ground state wave function, $\langle \Psi_T | \Psi_0 \rangle$, by DMC methods,[115] is an very efficient way of assessing wave function quality. There is also a trend that correlates the variational energy of the wave function with associated variance in a linear relationship [95, 96]. This correlation is expected because both properties, δ_E , and δ_{E_L} , approach limits $-E_o$ and zero respectively – as wave function quality improves. Observing this correlations is a good method of validating the optimization method, as well as assessing wave function quality.

5 Projector methods

QMC methods such as DMC and GFMC are usefully called projector Monte Carlo (PMC) methods ⁷. The general idea is to project out a state of the Hamiltonian by iteration of a projection operator, $\hat{P}$. For simplicity, we assume that the desired state is the ground state, Ψ_o , but projectors can be constructed for any state,

$$\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \hat{P}^i |\Psi_T\rangle \approx |\Psi_0\rangle. \quad (45)$$

After sufficient iterations i , the contribution of all excited states $|\Psi_i\rangle$, will be filtered out, and only the ground state is recovered.

If $|\Psi_T\rangle$ is a vector and $\hat{P}$ is a matrix, then the procedure implied by 45 is the algebraic power method: If a matrix is applied iteratively to an initial arbitrary

⁷The introductory section of this Chapter, follows the work of [116, 117, 118].

vector for a sufficient number of times, only the dominant eigenvector, $|\Psi_o\rangle$, will survive. One can see for large i ,

$$\hat{P}^i|\Psi_T\rangle = \lambda_o^i\langle\Psi_o|\Psi_T\rangle|\Psi_o\rangle + \mathcal{O}(\lambda_1^i), \quad (46)$$

where λ_o is the leading eigenvalue, and λ_1 is the largest sub-leading eigenvalue.

For this approach, it is possible to obtain an estimator of the eigenvalue, as described in [62], given by,

$$\lambda_o = \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{\langle\phi|\hat{P}^{i+j}|\Psi_T\rangle}{\langle\phi|\hat{P}^i|\Psi_T\rangle} \right)^{\frac{1}{j}} \quad (47)$$

5.0.2 Markov processes and stochastic projection

For high dimensional vectors, such as those encountered in molecular electronic structure, the algebraic power method described previously needs to be generalized with stochastic implementation. For this to occur, the projection operator must be symmetric, so that all eigenvalues are real. This is the case for QMC methods, because $\hat{P}$ is a function of the Hamiltonian operator, $\hat{H}$, which is Hermitian by construction.

A stochastic matrix is a normalized non-negative matrix. By normalization, we mean that the stochastic matrix columns add to one, $\sum_i M_{ij} = 1$. An $\mathbf{R}$ -space representation would be a stochastic propagator $M(\mathbf{R}, \mathbf{R}')$ that satisfies the condition

$$\int M(\mathbf{R}, \mathbf{R}') d\mathbf{R}' = 1. \quad (48)$$

A Markov chain is a sequence of states obtained from subsequent transitions from state i to j with a probability related to the stochastic matrix element M_{ij} , in which the move only depends on the current state, i . For example, in $\mathbf{R}$ -space, this is equivalent to the following process

$$\begin{aligned} \pi(\mathbf{R}') &= \int M(\mathbf{R}', \mathbf{R}'') \pi(\mathbf{R}'') d\mathbf{R}'' \\ \pi(\mathbf{R}) &= \int M(\mathbf{R}, \mathbf{R}') \pi(\mathbf{R}') d\mathbf{R}' \\ &\dots \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

The sequence of states $S = \{\pi(\mathbf{R}''), \pi(\mathbf{R}'), \pi(\mathbf{R}), \dots\}$ is the Markov chain.

The propagators of QMC for electronic structure are not generally normalized, therefore they are not stochastic matrices, but we can represent them in terms of the latter by factoring,

$$\hat{P}_{ij} = M_{ij} w_j, \quad (50)$$

where the weights, w_j , are defined by $w_j = \sum_i \hat{P}_{ij}$. This definition unambiguously defines both, the associated stochastic matrix M and the weight vector w .

A MC sampling scheme of $\hat{P}_{ij}|\Psi_T\rangle$ can be generated by first performing a random walk, and keep a weight vector, $W(\mathbf{R})$ for the random walkers,

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi(\mathbf{R}') &\equiv \pi(\mathbf{R}')W(\mathbf{R}') = \int P(\mathbf{R}', \mathbf{R}'')\Psi(\mathbf{R}'')d\mathbf{R}'' &= \int M(\mathbf{R}', \mathbf{R}'')B(\mathbf{R}')\Psi(\mathbf{R}'')d\mathbf{R}'' \\ \Psi(\mathbf{R}) &\equiv \pi(\mathbf{R})W(\mathbf{R}) = \int P(\mathbf{R}, \mathbf{R}')\Psi(\mathbf{R}')d\mathbf{R}' &= \int M(\mathbf{R}, \mathbf{R}')B(\mathbf{R})\Psi(\mathbf{R}')d\mathbf{R}' \quad (51) \\ & & \dots\end{aligned}$$

Here, $B(\mathbf{R})$ is the function that determines the weight of the configurations at each state of the random chain. This leads to a generalized stochastic projection algorithm for unnormalized transition probabilities that forms the basis for population Monte Carlo (PopMC) algorithms, which are not only used for QMC, but they are also used for statistical information processing and robotic vision [119]. A generalized PopMC stochastic projection algorithm, represented in $\mathbf{R}$ -space follows,

1. INITIALIZE

Generate a set of $\mathbf{n}$ random walkers, located at different spatial positions, $\mathcal{W} \equiv \{\mathbf{R}_1, \mathbf{R}_2, \dots, \mathbf{R}_n\}$, where $\mathbf{R}_i$ denotes a Dirac Delta function at that point in space, $\delta(\mathbf{R} - \mathbf{R}_i)$. These points are intended to sample a probability density function $\Phi(\mathbf{R})$.

2. MOVE

- (a) Each walker j is moved independently from $\mathbf{R}$ to a new position $\mathbf{R}'$, according to the transition probability

$$T(\mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}') \equiv M(\mathbf{R}, \mathbf{R}') \quad (52)$$

- (b) Ensure detailed balance if $T(\mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}') \neq T(\mathbf{R}' \rightarrow \mathbf{R})$, by using a Metropolis acceptance/rejection step as in Eq. 42

3. WEIGHT

- (a) Calculate a weight vector using a weighting function $B(\mathbf{R}_i)$

$$w_i^* = B(\mathbf{R}_i) \quad (53)$$

The ideal weight function preserves normalization of $\hat{P}(\mathbf{R}, \mathbf{R}')$ and maintains individual weights, w_i close to unity.

- (b) Update the weight of the walker, multiplying the weight of the previous iteration by the weight of the new iteration,

$$w'_i = w_i^* * w_i \quad (54)$$

4. RECONFIGURATION

- (a) Split walkers with large weights into multiple walkers with weights that add up to the original weight.
- (b) Remove walkers with small weight.

Step 4 is necessary to avoid statistical fluctuations in the weights. It is a form of importance sampling in the sense that makes the calculation stable over time. Some algorithms omit this step; see, for example, efforts by [84], but it has been proved that such calculations eventually diverge [120]. There is a slight bias associated with the introduction of step 4 together with population control methods, that will be discussed in Sec. 5.3. When step 4 is used, $B(\mathbf{R})$ is also referred in the literature as a *branching factor*.

It is important to recall that PopMC algorithms are not canonical Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) algorithms [121, 69], in the sense that the propagator used is not normalized, and therefore factoring the propagator into a normalized transition probability and a weighting function is required.

5.0.3 Projection operators or Green's functions

Different projection operators lead to different QMC methods. If the resolvent operator,

$$\hat{P}(\hat{H}) \equiv \frac{1}{1 + \delta\tau(\hat{H} - E_R)}, \quad (55)$$

is used, one obtains Green's function Monte Carlo (GFMC) [50, 122]. This algorithm will be described in Sec. 5.5

If the imaginary time evolution operator is used, i.e.,

$$\hat{P}(\hat{H}) \equiv e^{-\delta\tau(\hat{H} - E_R)}, \quad (56)$$

one has the DMC method [123, 124], which is discussed in Sec. 5.1.2.

For finite $\delta\tau$, and for molecular systems, the exact projector is not known analytically. In GFMC, the resolvent of Eq. 55 is sampled by iteration of a simpler resolvent, whereas for DMC, the resolvent is known exactly at $\tau \rightarrow 0$, so an extrapolation to $\delta\tau \rightarrow 0$ is done.

Note that any decreasing function of $\hat{H}$ can serve as a projector. Therefore, new QMC methods still await to be explored.

5.1 Imaginary propagator

If one transforms the time-dependent Schrödinger equation (Eq. 2) to imaginary time, i. e.,

$$it \rightarrow \tau \quad (57)$$

then one obtains

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \tau} \Psi(\mathbf{R}, \tau) = (\hat{H} - E_R) \Psi(\mathbf{R}, \tau). \quad (58)$$

Here E_R is an energy offset, called the reference energy. For real $\Psi(\mathbf{R}, \tau)$, this equation has the advantage of being an equation in $\mathcal{R}^N$, whereas Eq. 2, has in general, complex solutions.

Equation 58 can be cast into integral form,

$$\Psi(\mathbf{R}, \tau + \delta\tau) = \lambda_\tau \int G(\mathbf{R}, \mathbf{R}', \delta\tau) \Psi(\mathbf{R}', \tau) d\mathbf{R}' \quad (59)$$

The Green's function, $G(\mathbf{R}', \mathbf{R}, \delta\tau)$, satisfies the same boundary conditions as Eq. 58,

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \tau} G(\mathbf{R}, \mathbf{R}', \delta\tau) = (\hat{H} - E_T) G(\mathbf{R}, \mathbf{R}', \delta\tau) \quad (60)$$

with the initial conditions associated with the propagation of a Dirac delta function, namely,

$$G(\mathbf{R}, \mathbf{R}', 0) = \delta(\mathbf{R} - \mathbf{R}') \quad (61)$$

The form of the Green's function that satisfies Eq. 60, subject to 61 is,

$$G(\mathbf{R}, \mathbf{R}', \delta\tau) = \langle \mathbf{R} | e^{-\tau(\hat{H} - E_R)} | \mathbf{R}' \rangle \quad (62)$$

This operator can be expanded in eigenfunctions, Ψ_α , and eigenvalues E_α of the system,

$$G(\mathbf{R}, \mathbf{R}', \delta\tau) = \sum_{\alpha} e^{-\tau(E_\alpha - E_R)} \Psi_\alpha^*(\mathbf{R}') \Psi_\alpha(\mathbf{R}) \quad (63)$$

For an arbitrary initial trial function, $\Psi(\mathbf{R})$, in the long term limit, $\tau \rightarrow \infty$, one has

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\tau \rightarrow \infty} e^{-\tau(\hat{H} - E_T)} \Psi &= \lim_{\tau \rightarrow \infty} \int G(\mathbf{R}', \mathbf{R}, \tau) \Psi(\mathbf{R}') d\mathbf{R}' = \\ &\lim_{\tau \rightarrow \infty} \langle \Psi | \Psi_o \rangle e^{-\tau(E_o - E_R)} \phi_o, \end{aligned} \quad (64)$$

and only the ground state wave function Ψ_o is obtained from any initial wave function. Therefore, the imaginary time evolution operator can be used as a projection operator as mentioned at the beginning of this Chapter.

5.1.1 Diffusion Monte Carlo stochastic projection

Due to the high dimensionality of molecular systems, a MC projection procedure is used for obtaining expectation values. In this approach, the wave function is represented as an ensemble of delta functions, also known as configurations, walkers, or *psips* (psi-particles):

$$\Phi(R) \longleftrightarrow \sum_k \delta(\mathbf{R} - \mathbf{R}_k) \quad (65)$$

The wave function is propagated in imaginary time using the Green's function. In the continuous case, one can construct a Neumann series,

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi^{(2)}(\mathbf{R}, \tau) &= \lambda_1 \int G(\mathbf{R}', \mathbf{R}, \tau_2 - \tau_1) \Psi^{(1)}(\mathbf{R}') d\mathbf{R}' \\ \Psi^{(3)}(\mathbf{R}, \tau) &= \lambda_2 \int G(\mathbf{R}', \mathbf{R}, \tau_3 - \tau_2) \Psi^{(2)}(\mathbf{R}') d\mathbf{R}' \\ &\quad (\dots) \end{aligned} \quad (66)$$

This Neumann series is a specific case of the PopMC propagation of Sec. 5.0.2. The discrete Neumann series can be constructed in a similar way:

$$\Phi^{(n+1)}(\mathbf{R}, \tau + \delta\tau) \longleftrightarrow \lambda_k \sum_k G^{(n)}(\mathbf{R}, \mathbf{R}', \delta\tau) \quad (67)$$

Therefore, a stochastic vector of configurations $\mathcal{W} \equiv \{\mathbf{R}_1, \dots, \mathbf{R}_n\}$ is used to represent $\Psi(\mathbf{R})$ and is iterated using $G^{(n)}(\mathbf{R}, \mathbf{R}', \delta\tau)$.

5.1.2 The form of the propagator

Sampling Eq. 62 can not be done exactly, because the argument of the exponential is an operator composed of two terms that do not commute with each other.

In the short-time approximation (STA), the propagator $G(\mathbf{R}, \mathbf{R}_k, d\tau)$ is approximated as if the kinetic and potential energy operators commuted with each other,

$$e^{(T+V)\delta\tau} \approx e^{T\delta\tau} \cdot e^{V\delta\tau} + \mathcal{O}((\delta\tau)^2) \equiv G_{ST} \equiv G_D \cdot G_B \quad (68)$$

The Green's function then becomes the product of a diffusion factor, G_D and a branching factor G_B . Both propagators are known,

$$G_D = (2\pi\tau)^{-3N/2} e^{-\frac{(\mathbf{R}-\mathbf{R}')^2}{2\tau}}, \quad (69)$$

and,

$$G_B = e^{-\delta\tau(V(\mathbf{R}) - 2E_T)}. \quad (70)$$

G_D is a fundamental solution of the Fourier equation (that describes a diffusion process in wave function space) and G_B is the fundamental solution of a first-order kinetic birth-death process.

The Campbell-Baker-Hausdorff (CBH) formula,

$$e^A e^B = e^{A+B+\frac{1}{2}[A,B]+\frac{1}{12}[(A-B),[A,B]]+\dots} \quad (71)$$

can help in constructing more accurate decompositions, such as an expansion with a cubic error $\mathcal{O}((\delta\tau)^3)$,

$$e^{\delta\tau(T+V)} = e^{\delta\tau(V/2)} e^{\delta\tau T} e^{\delta\tau(V/2)} + \mathcal{O}((\delta\tau)^3) \quad (72)$$

There are more sophisticated second order, [117], and fourth order, [125, 126], expansions that reduce the error considerably and make more exact DMC algorithms at the expense of a more complex propagator.

The most common implementation using G_D as a stochastic transition probability $T(\mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}')$, and G_B as a weighting or branching factor, $B(\mathbf{R})$. Sampling of Eq. 69 can be achieved by obtaining random variates from a Gaussian distribution of standard deviation $\delta\tau$, $\mathcal{G}_{\delta\tau}$.

5.2 Importance sampling

Direct application of the algorithm of the previous section to systems governed by the Coloumb potential leads to large population fluctuations. These arise because the potential $\hat{V}(\mathbf{R})$ becomes unbounded and induces large fluctuations in the random walker population. A remedy, importance sampling, was first used for GFMC in 1962 [50] and extended to the DMC method in 1980 [5].

In importance sampling, the goal is to reduce fluctuations, by multiplying the probability distribution by a known trial function, $\Psi_T(\mathbf{R})$, that is expected to be a good approximation for the wave function of the system. Rather than $\Psi(\mathbf{R}, \tau)$, one samples the product,

$$f(\mathbf{R}, \tau) = \Psi_T(\mathbf{R}) \Psi(\mathbf{R}, \tau) \quad (73)$$

Multiplying Eq. 59 by $\Psi_T(\mathbf{R})$, one obtains,

$$f(\mathbf{R}, \tau + d\tau) = \int K(\mathbf{R}', \mathbf{R}, \delta\tau) f(\mathbf{R}', \tau) d\mathbf{R}', \quad (74)$$

where $K(\mathbf{R}, \mathbf{R}', \delta\tau) \equiv e^{-\tau(\hat{H}-E_T)} \frac{\Psi_T(\mathbf{R})}{\Psi_T(\mathbf{R}')} e^{\delta\tau(\hat{H}-E_T)}$. Expanding K in a Taylor series, at the $\delta\tau \rightarrow 0$ limit, one obtains the expression,

$$K = N e^{-(\mathbf{R}_2 - \mathbf{R}_1 + \frac{1}{2} \nabla \ln \Psi_T(\mathbf{R}_1) \delta\tau)^2 / (2\delta\tau)} \times e^{-(\frac{\hat{H} \Psi_T(\mathbf{R}_1)}{\Psi_T(\mathbf{R}_1)} - E_T) \delta\tau} \equiv K_D \times K_B \quad (75)$$

Equation 75 is closely associated to the product of the Kernel of the Smoluchowski equation, which describes a diffusion process with drift, multiplied by a first order rate process. Here the rate process is dominated by the local energy, instead of the potential. The random walk is modified by appearance of a drift term that moves configurations to regions of high values of the wave function. This drift is the quantum force of Eq. 20.

The excess local energy ($E_T - E_L(\mathbf{R})$) replaces the excess potential energy in the branching term exponent, see 70. The local energy has kinetic and potential energy contributions that tend to cancel each other, giving a smoother function: If $\Psi_T(\mathbf{R})$ is a reasonable function, the excess local energy will be nearly a constant. The regions where charged particles meet have to be taken care of by enforcing the cusp conditions on $\Psi_T(\mathbf{R})$ (See Sec. 2).

The local energy is the estimator of the energy with a lower statistical variance, so it is preferred over other possible choices for an estimator. A simple average of the local energy will yield the estimator of the energy of the quantum system⁸,

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle E_L \rangle &= \int f(\mathbf{R}, \tau \rightarrow \infty) E_L(\mathbf{R}) d\mathbf{R} / \int f(\mathbf{R}) d\mathbf{R} \\
&= \int \Psi(\mathbf{R}) \Psi_T(\mathbf{R}) \left[\frac{\hat{H} \Psi_T(\mathbf{R})}{\Psi_T(\mathbf{R})} \right] d\mathbf{R} / \int \Psi(\mathbf{R}) \Psi_T(\mathbf{R}) \\
&= \int \Psi(\mathbf{R}) \hat{H} \Psi(\mathbf{R}) d\mathbf{R} / \int \Psi(\mathbf{R}) \Psi_T(\mathbf{R}) d\mathbf{R} \\
&= E_o
\end{aligned} \tag{76}$$

Therefore, a simple averaging of the local energy, will yield the DMC energy estimator:

$$\langle E_L \rangle = \lim_{N_s \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N_s} \sum_i^{N_w} E_L(\mathbf{R}_i) \tag{77}$$

Because the importance sampled propagator, $K(\mathbf{R}, \mathbf{R}', \delta\tau)$, is only exact to a certain order, for obtaining an exact estimator is necessary to extrapolate to $\delta\tau = 0$ for several values of $\langle E_L \rangle$.

Importance sampling with appropriate trial functions, such as those used for accurate VMC calculations, can increase the efficiency of the random walk by several orders of magnitude. In the limit required to obtain the exact trial function, only a single evaluation of the local energy is required to obtain the exact answer. Importance sampling has made molecular and atomic calculations feasible. Note that the quantum force present in Eq. 75 also moves random walkers away from the nodal regions into regions of large values of the trial wave function, reducing the number of attempted node crossings by several orders of magnitude.

5.3 Population control

If left uncontrolled, the population of random walkers will eventually vanish or fill all computer memory. Therefore, some form of population control is needed to stabilize the number of random walkers. Control is usually achieved by slowly

⁸For other energy estimators, refer to the discussion in [122] and [9].

changing E_T as the simulation progresses. As more walkers are produced in the procedure, one needs to lower the trial energy, E_T , or if the population starts to decrease, then one needs to raise E_T . This can be achieved by periodically changing the trial energy. One version of the adjustment is to use,

$$E_T = \langle E_o \rangle + \alpha \ln \frac{N_w^0}{N_w}, \quad (78)$$

where $\langle E_o \rangle$ is the best approximation to the eigenvalue of the problem to this point, α is a parameter that should be as small as possible while still having a population control effect, N_w^0 is the number of desired random walkers, and N_w is the current number of random walkers.

This simple population control procedure has a slight bias if the population control parameter α is large, or if the population is small. The bias observed goes as $1/N_w$, and, formally a $N_w \rightarrow \infty$ extrapolation is required. The bias is absent in the limit of an infinite population.

A recently resurrected population control strategy, stochastic reconfiguration [127, 128, 129, 120] originally came from the work of [116]. In this algorithm, walkers carry a weight, but the weight is redetermined at each step to keep the population constant. The idea behind this method is to control the global weight $\bar{w}$ of the population,

$$\bar{w} = \frac{1}{N_w} \sum_{i=1}^{N_w} w_i \quad (79)$$

The idea is to introduce a renormalized individual walker weight, ω_i , defined as,

$$\omega_i \equiv \frac{w_i}{\bar{w}}. \quad (80)$$

Another stochastic reconfiguration scheme proposes setting the number of copies of walker i for the next step, proportional to the renormalized walker weight, ω_i . This algorithm has shown to have less bias than the scheme of Eq. 78, and also has the advantage of having the same number of walkers at each step, simplifying implementations of the algorithm in parallel computers.

5.4 Diffusion Monte Carlo algorithm

There are several versions of the DMC algorithm. The approach presented here focuses on simplicity. For the latest developments, the reader is referred to the references [124, 130, 131].

1. Initialize an ensemble $\mathcal{W}$ of $N_{\mathcal{W}}$ configurations, distributed according to $P(\mathbf{R})$ for $\Psi_T(\mathbf{R})$; for example, use the random walkers obtained from a previous VMC run.
2. For every configuration in $\mathcal{W}$,

- (a) Propose an electron move from $\Psi(\mathbf{R}) \equiv \Psi(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2, \dots, \mathbf{r}_i, \dots, \mathbf{r}_{N_p})$ to $\Psi(\mathbf{R}') \equiv \Psi(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2, \dots, \mathbf{r}'_i, \dots, \mathbf{r}_{N_p})$. The short-time approximation propagator, $K(\mathbf{R}, \mathbf{R}'; \delta\tau)$, has an associated stochastic move,

$$\mathbf{R}' \rightarrow \mathbf{R} + \mathbf{F}_q(\mathbf{R})\delta\tau + \mathcal{G}_{\delta\tau} \quad (81)$$

- (b) Enforce the fixed node constraint: if a random walker crosses a node, i.e. $\text{sign}(\Psi_T(\mathbf{R})) \neq \text{sign}(\Psi_T(\mathbf{R}'))$, then reject the move for the current electron and proceed to treat the next electron.
- (c) Compute the Metropolis acceptance/rejection probability

$$P(\mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}') = \min \left(1, \frac{K_D(\mathbf{R}, \mathbf{R}'; \delta\tau) \Psi_T^2(\mathbf{R}')}{K_D(\mathbf{R}', \mathbf{R}; \delta\tau) \Psi_T^2(\mathbf{R})} \right), \quad (82)$$

where K_D is the diffusion and drift transition probability given by Eq. 75.

- (d) Compare $P(\mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}')$ with a uniform random number between 0 and 1, $\mathcal{U}_{[0,1]}$, if $P > \mathcal{U}_{[0,1]}$, accept the move, otherwise, reject it.

3. Calculate the branching factor G_B for the current configuration

$$B(\mathbf{R}, \mathbf{R}') = e^{(E_R - \frac{1}{2}(\frac{\hat{H}\Psi_T(\mathbf{R}')}{\Psi_T(\mathbf{R}')} + \frac{\hat{H}\Psi_T(\mathbf{R})}{\Psi_T(\mathbf{R})}))\delta\tau}. \quad (83)$$

4. Accumulate all observables, such as the energy. All contributions, O_i , are weighted by the branching factor, i. e.,

$$O_T^{(n+1)} = O_T^{(n)} + B(\mathbf{R}, \mathbf{R}')O_i(\mathbf{R}), \quad (84)$$

where $O_T^{(n)}$ is the cumulative sum of the observable at step n .

5. Generate a new generation of random walkers, reproducing the existing population, creating an average $B(\mathbf{R}, \mathbf{R}')$ new walkers out of a walker at $\mathbf{R}$. The simplest procedure for achieving this goal is to generate n new copies of $\mathbf{R}$ where $n = \text{int}(B(\mathbf{R}, \mathbf{R}') + \mathcal{U}_{[0,1]})$.
6. Perform blocking statistics (see Sec. 3.1.2), and apply population control (see Sec. 5.3)

- (a) One choice is to update the reference energy, E_R at the end of each accumulation block,

$$E_R \leftarrow E_R + E_R^\omega * E_B, \quad (85)$$

where E_R^ω is a re-weighting parameter, usually chosen to be ≈ 0.5 , and E_B is the average energy for block B , $E_B = E^{sum}/N_B$

- (b) Discard a relaxation time of steps, N_{Rel} , which is of the order of a tenth of a block, because moving the reference energy induces the most bias in about one relaxation time.

7. Continue the loop until the desired accuracy is achieved.

Umrigar *et al.* [131] proposed several modifications to the above algorithm to reduce time-step error. These modifications concentrate on improving the propagator in regions where the short-time approximation performs poorly; namely, near wave function nodes and Coulomb singularities. These propagator errors are expected, because the short-time approximation propagator assumes a constant potential over the move interval, which is a poor approximation in Ψ regions where the Coulomb interaction diverges.

5.5 Green's function Monte Carlo

The GFMC method is a QMC approach that has the advantage of having no time-step error. It has been shown to require more computer time than DMC, and therefore, has been applied less frequently than DMC to atomic and molecular systems. Good descriptions of the method can be found in [50, 132, 133, 65, 134]. The GFMC approach is a PopMC method for which the projector for obtaining the ground state Green's function is the standard resolvent for the Schrödinger equation (see Eq. 55). The integral equation for this case, takes the simple form,

$$\Psi^{(n+1)} = \left[\frac{E_T + E_C}{\hat{H} + E_C} \right] \Psi^{(n)} \quad (86)$$

where the constant E_C is positive and fulfills the condition that $|E_C| > |E_o|$, and E_T is a trial energy. The resolvent of Eq. 86 is related to the DMC propagator by the one-sided Laplace transform,

$$\frac{1}{\hat{H} + E_C} = \int_0^\infty e^{-(\hat{H} + E_C)\tau} d\tau \quad (87)$$

This integral is evaluated by MC. After equilibration, the sampled times have a Poisson distribution with a mean of $\frac{N_s}{E_o + E_C}$ after N_s steps. E_C is a parameter that controls the average time step.

The Green's function is not known in close form, so it has to be sampled by MC. This can be done by rewriting the resolvent in the form,

$$\frac{1}{\hat{H} + E_C} = \frac{1}{\hat{H}_U + E_C} + \frac{1}{\hat{H}_U + E_C} (\hat{H}_U - \hat{H}) \frac{1}{\hat{H} + E_C} \quad (88)$$

The Hamiltonian $\hat{H}_U$ represents a family of solvable Hamiltonians. To sample the Green's function, one samples the sum of terms on the right-hand side of Eq. 88.. The Green's functions associated with $\hat{H}$ and $\hat{H}_U$, satisfy the relations,

$$(\hat{H} + E_C)G(\mathbf{R}, \mathbf{R}') = \delta(\mathbf{R} - \mathbf{R}') \quad (89)$$

$$(\hat{H}_U + E_C)G_U(\mathbf{R}, \mathbf{R}') = \delta(\mathbf{R} - \mathbf{R}') \quad (90)$$

The most commonly used form of $\hat{H}_U$ is,

$$\hat{H}_U = \frac{1}{2} \nabla_R^2 + U \quad (91)$$

where U is a potential that is independent of $\mathbf{R}$. It is convenient to have $G_U(\mathbf{R}, \mathbf{R}')$ vanish at the domain boundary. $\hat{H}_U$ should be a good approximation to $\hat{H}$ in the domain to achieve good convergence.

The $\mathbf{R}$ -space representation of Eq. 88 is

$$\begin{aligned} G(\mathbf{R}, \mathbf{R}') = & G_U(\mathbf{R}, \mathbf{R}') - \int_S d\mathbf{R}'' G(\mathbf{R}, \mathbf{R}'') [-\hat{n} \cdot \nabla G_U(\mathbf{R}'', \mathbf{R})] \\ & + \int_V d\mathbf{R}'' G(\mathbf{R}, \mathbf{R}'') [U - V(\mathbf{R}'')] G_U(\mathbf{R}'', \mathbf{R}') \end{aligned} \quad (92)$$

5.6 Fixed-node approximation

We have not discussed the implications of the fermion character of $\Psi(\mathbf{R})$. It is an excited state in a manifold containing all the fermionic and bosonic states. A fermion wave function has positive and negative regions that are difficult to sample with the DMC algorithm as described in Sec. 5.4. Considering real wave functions, $\Psi(\mathbf{R})$ contains positive and negative regions, $\Psi^+(\mathbf{R})$, and $\Psi^-(\mathbf{R})$ that, in principle, could be represented as probabilities. The sign of the wave function could be used as an extra weight for the random walk. In practice, this is a very slowly convergent method.

Returning to the importance sampled algorithm, recall that the initial distribution, $|\Psi(\mathbf{R})|^2$, is positive. Nevertheless, the Green's function, $K(\mathbf{R}, \mathbf{R}')$, can become negative, if a random walker crosses a node of the trial wave function. Again, the sign of $K(\mathbf{R}, \mathbf{R}')$ could be used as a weight for sampling $|K(\mathbf{R}, \mathbf{R}')|$. The problem is that the statistics of this process lead to exponential growth of the variance of any observable.

The simplest approach to avoid exponential growth is to forbid moves in which the product wave function, $\Psi(\mathbf{R})\Psi_T(\mathbf{R})$, changes sign. This boundary condition on permitted moves is the defining characteristic of the fixed-node approximation (FNA). The nodes of the sampled wave function are *fixed* to be the nodes of the trial wave function. The FNA is an inherent feature of the DMC method, which is, by far, the most commonly used method for atomic and molecular MC applications [123, 124].

The fixed-node energy is an upper bound to the exact energy of the system. In fact, it is the best solution for that fixed set of nodes. The DMC method has much higher accuracy than the VMC method. For atomic and molecular systems, it is common to recover 95 – 100% of the CE, cf Sec. 1, whereas the CE recovered with the VMC approach is typically less than 80% of the total.

5.7 Exact methods

Probably the most important algorithmic challenge that still remains to be explored is the “node problem”. Although progress has been made in systems that contain up to a dozen of electrons [135, 136, 137, 138, 139], a stable algorithm that can sample the exact wave function without resorting to the FNA remains to be determined. In this section, we discuss a family of methods that avoid the FNA. These approaches yield exact answers, usually associated with a large increase in computational time.

The Pauli antisymmetry principle imposes a boundary condition on the wave function. It is the requirement that the exchange of like-spin electrons changes the sign of the wave function. This condition is a global condition that has to be enforced within an algorithm that only considers individual random walkers, i.e., a local algorithm. The FNA is the most commonly imposed boundary condition. It satisfies the variational principle, i.e, FN solutions approach the exact energy from above. This is an useful property, but one that does not assist the search for exact results, because there is not an easy way to parametrize the nodal surface and vary it to obtain the exact solution. We now describe methods that impose no additional boundary conditions on the wave function.

5.7.1 The release node method

The evolution operator, $e^{-\tau(\hat{H}-E_T)}$, is symmetric and has the same form for both fermions and bosons. Straightforward application of it to an arbitrary initial wave function, $|\Psi_o\rangle$, leads to collapse to the ground state bosonic wave function, as can be seen from Eq. 64.

An arbitrary fermion wave function, $\Psi(\mathbf{R})$, can be separated into two functions, $\Psi^+(\mathbf{R})$, and $\Psi^-(\mathbf{R})$, as follows,

$$\Psi^\pm(\mathbf{R}, \tau) \equiv \frac{1}{2} [|\Psi(\mathbf{R}, \tau)| \pm \Psi(\mathbf{R}, \tau)]. \quad (93)$$

Note that the original trial wave function is recovered as,

$$\Psi(\mathbf{R}, \tau) = \Psi^+(\mathbf{R}, \tau) - \Psi^-(\mathbf{R}, \tau) \quad (94)$$

The released node (RN) algorithm involves two independent DMC calculations, using Ψ^+ and Ψ^- as the wave functions to evolve,

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi(\mathbf{R}, \tau) &= \int G(\mathbf{R}, \mathbf{R}', \delta\tau) \Psi(\mathbf{R}', 0) d\mathbf{R}' = \\ &\int G(\mathbf{R}, \mathbf{R}', \tau) \Psi^+(\mathbf{R}', 0) d\mathbf{R}' - \int G(\mathbf{R}, \mathbf{R}', \tau) \Psi^-(\mathbf{R}', 0) d\mathbf{R}' = \\ &\Psi^+(\mathbf{R}, \tau) - \Psi^-(\mathbf{R}, \tau) \end{aligned} \quad (95)$$

The time evolution of the system can be followed from the difference of separate simulations for $\Psi^\pm(\mathbf{R})$. Note that both distributions are always positive

during the simulation, and that they decay to the ground state bosonic wave function. This decay is problematic because the “signal-to-noise” ratio in this method depends on the difference between these two distributions. The decay of the difference $\Psi^+(\mathbf{R}, \tau) - \Psi^-(\mathbf{R}, \tau)$ goes roughly as $e^{\tau(E_F - E_B)}$, where E_F is the lowest fermion state energy and E_B is the bosonic ground state energy.

For this method to be practical, one needs to start with the distribution of a good fermion trial wave function. The distribution will evolve from this starting point to the bosonic ground state at large imaginary time τ . In an intermediate “transient” regime one can collect information on the exact fermion wave function.

The energy can be estimated from the expression,

$$\begin{aligned} E_{RN}(\tau) &= \frac{\int \Psi(\mathbf{R}, \tau) \hat{H} \Psi_T(\mathbf{R}) d\mathbf{R}}{\int \Psi(\mathbf{R}, \tau) \Psi_T(\mathbf{R}) d\mathbf{R}} \\ &= \frac{\int \Psi^+(\mathbf{R}, \tau) \hat{H} \Psi_T(\mathbf{R}) d\mathbf{R}}{\int [\Psi^+(\mathbf{R}, \tau) - \Psi^-(\mathbf{R}, \tau)] \Psi_T(\mathbf{R}) d\mathbf{R}} - \frac{\int \Psi^-(\mathbf{R}, \tau) \hat{H} \Psi_T(\mathbf{R}) d\mathbf{R}}{\int [\Psi^+(\mathbf{R}, \tau) - \Psi^-(\mathbf{R}, \tau)] \Psi_T(\mathbf{R}) d\mathbf{R}} \\ &= E_F \end{aligned} \tag{96}$$

In the release node method [136], a fixed-node distribution is propagated as usual, but now two sets of random walkers are retained, $\mathcal{W}_{FN}$, the fixed node ensemble and $\mathcal{W}_{RN}$, the released node ensemble. Walkers are allowed to cross nodes, and when they do, they are transferred from $\mathcal{W}_{FN}$ to $\mathcal{W}_{RN}$. Also an account is made of the number of iterations that a walker has survived, $\mathcal{S}_{RN} = \{s_1, \dots, s_{N_w}\}$. This index is used to bin the walkers by age. Each time a walker crosses a node, a summation weight associated with it, $\Omega_{RN} = \{\omega_1, \dots, \omega_{N_w}\}$ changes sign. These weights determine the sign of the walker contribution to global averages.

The released node energy can be calculated using the estimator,

$$E_{RN} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N_w} \omega_i \frac{\Psi_T(\mathbf{R}_i)}{\Psi(\mathbf{R}_i)} E_L(\mathbf{R}_i)}{\sum_{i=1}^{N_w} \omega_i \frac{\Psi_T(\mathbf{R}_i)}{\Psi(\mathbf{R}_i)}}. \tag{97}$$

5.7.2 Fermion Monte Carlo

From the previous section one can infer that if a method in which the distribution does not go to the bosonic ground state, but stays in an intermediate regime, will not have the deficiency of exponential growth of “signal to noise”. This leads to the fermion Monte Carlo (FMC) method. The approach [140, 141, 142, 143, 144] involves correlated random walks that achieve a constant “signal to noise”.

The expectation value of Eq. 97 for an arbitrary distribution of signed walkers can be rewritten as

$$\langle E_{FMC} \rangle = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{Nw} [\frac{\hat{H}\psi_T(\mathbf{R}_i^+)}{\Psi_G^+(R_i^+)} - \frac{\hat{H}\psi_T(\mathbf{R}_i^-)}{\Psi_G^-(R_i^-)}]}{\sum_{i=1}^{Nw} [\frac{\psi_T(R_i^+)}{\Psi_G^+(R_i^+)} \frac{\psi_T(R_i^-)}{\Psi_G^-(R_i^-)}]} \quad (98)$$

where $\Psi_G^\pm(\mathbf{R}^\pm)$ are the guiding functions for a pair of random walkers $P_i = \{\mathbf{R}_i^+, \mathbf{R}_i^-\}$. Note that the variance of the energy estimator of Eq. 98 goes to infinity as the difference between the two populations goes to zero, i. e. the denominator,

$$\mathcal{D} \equiv \sum_{i=1}^{Nw} [\frac{\psi_T(R_i^+)}{\Psi_G^+(R_i^+)} \frac{\psi_T(R_i^-)}{\Psi_G^-(R_i^-)}], \quad (99)$$

goes to zero as the simulation approaches to the bosonic ground state. A procedure that would not change $\langle E_{FMC} \rangle$ would be to cancel positive and negative random walkers whenever they meet [135]. Although random walks are guaranteed to meet in one dimension, they need not meet in several dimensions, due to the exponentially decaying walker density in $\mathbf{R}$ -space. Besides, cancellation has to be combined with other procedures to insure a stable algorithm.

Cancellation can be increased by introducing correlation between the random walkers. Recall the diffusion step in DMC, in which walkers diffuse from $\mathbf{R}$ to $\mathbf{R}'$ following G_D of Eq. 69. In the DMC algorithm, this is implemented stochastically by updating the coordinates of the random walkers with a random displacement taken from a Gaussian distribution with a variance of $\delta\tau$,

$$\mathbf{R}'^+ \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^+ + \mathcal{G}_{\delta\tau}^+ \text{ and } \mathbf{R}'^- \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^- + \mathcal{G}_{\delta\tau}^-. \quad (100)$$

If we introduce correlation between the Gaussian vectors, $\mathcal{G}_{\delta\tau}^+$ and $\mathcal{G}_{\delta\tau}^-$, the expectation value of Eq. 98 is not affected, because it is linear in the density of random walkers.

An efficient cancellation scheme can be achieved if the Gaussian vectors are correlated as follows,

$$\mathcal{G}_{\delta\tau}^- = \mathcal{G}_{\delta\tau}^+ U^- - 2(\mathcal{G}_{\delta\tau}^+ \cdot \frac{(\mathbf{R}^+ - \mathbf{R}^-)}{|\mathbf{R}^+ - \mathbf{R}^-|^2}) \cdot (\mathbf{R}^+ - \mathbf{R}^-), \quad (101)$$

Equation 101 accounts for reflection along the perpendicular bisector of the vector that connects the pair, $\mathbf{R}^+ - \mathbf{R}^-$. This cancellation scheme generates a correlated random walk in one dimension along the vector $\mathbf{R}^+ - \mathbf{R}^-$. This one-dimensional random walk is independent of the number of dimensions of the physical system, and therefore, overcomes the cancellation difficulties mentioned above. Walkers are guaranteed to meet under these conditions.

The modifications to the DMC algorithm mentioned to this point are necessary, but not sufficient for achieving a stable algorithm. If one were to interchange the random walker populations, $\{\mathbf{R}_1^+, \dots, \mathbf{R}_{N_w}^+\} \leftrightarrow \{\mathbf{R}_1^-, \dots, \mathbf{R}_{N_w}^-\}$, the fictitious dynamics would not be able to distinguish between the two populations, leading to a random walk with two degenerate ground states. Namely,

a ground state in which all the positive walkers, $\mathbf{R}^+$ are marginally on the positive region of the wave function, and vice versa, $\{\Psi^+(\mathbf{R}^+), \Psi^-(\mathbf{R}^-)\}$ and $\{\Psi^+(\mathbf{R}^-), \Psi^-(\mathbf{R}^+)\}$. This *plus-minus* symmetry can be broken by using two distinct guiding functions. For example, the guiding function

$$\Psi_G^\pm = \sqrt{\Psi_S^2(\mathbf{R}) + c^2 \Psi_A^2(\mathbf{R})} \pm c \Psi_A(\mathbf{R}), \quad (102)$$

where $\Psi_S(\mathbf{R})$ is a symmetric function under permutation of electron labels; $\Psi_A(\mathbf{R})$ is an antisymmetric function, and c is a small adjustable parameter. The guiding functions of Eq. 102 are almost equal, which provides nearly identical branching factors for the walker pair. It is positive everywhere, a requirement for the DMC algorithm, and it is symmetric under permutation of the coordinates, $\Psi_G^+(\hat{\mathbf{P}}\mathbf{R}) = \Psi_G^-(\mathbf{R})$.

The use of different guiding functions is the last required ingredient for a stable algorithm. It breaks the *plus-minus* symmetry effectively, because the drift dynamics is different because the quantum force of Eq. 20 is distinct for each population.

For a complete description of the FMC algorithm, the reader is referred to [143].

The denominator of Eq. 99 is an indicator of stability of the algorithm. It is a measure of the antisymmetric component of the wave function. FMC calculations have shown stable denominators for thousands of relaxation times, indicating the stability of the fermion algorithm.

Early versions of the method [135] do not scale well with system size, due to the use of uncorrelated cancellation schemes. Nevertheless, researchers have been applied successfully to several small molecular systems obtaining solutions to the Schrödinger equation with no systematic error [137, 145, 146, 147]. This version of the FMC algorithm, with GFMC propagation and without correlated dynamics, is known as exact quantum Monte Carlo (EQMC).

5.8 Zero variance principle

An increase in computational efficiency can be achieved by improving the observables $\hat{O}$ by renormalizing them to observables that have the same expectation value, but lower variance. Recent work [148, 149] has shown that estimators for the energy and energy derivatives with respect to nuclear coordinates can be constructed.

One can propose a trial operator $\hat{H}_V$ and auxiliary trial function, Ψ_V such that the evaluation of a renormalized observable $\bar{O}$ will have a variance that is smaller than that of the original observable $\hat{O}$, and in principle can even be suppressed.

To develop this concept, let us construct a trial operator $\hat{H}_V$ such that,

$$\int \hat{H}_V(\mathbf{R}, \mathbf{R}') \sqrt{\pi(\mathbf{R}')} d\mathbf{R}' = 0, \quad (103)$$

where $\pi(\mathbf{R}')$ is the MC distribution. For example, in VMC the MC distribution is the wave function squared, $\Psi_T(\mathbf{R})^2$, and in DMC it is the mixed

distribution of Eq. 73. Next, propose a renormalized observable $\bar{O}(\mathbf{R})$ related to the observable $\hat{O}(\mathbf{R})$ given by,

$$\bar{O}(\mathbf{R}) = \hat{O}(\mathbf{R}) + \frac{\int \hat{H}_V(\mathbf{R}, \mathbf{R}') \psi_V(\mathbf{R}') d\mathbf{R}'}{\sqrt{\pi(\mathbf{R})}} \quad (104)$$

The mean of the rescaled operator is formally,

$$\langle \bar{O} \rangle = \frac{\int \hat{O}(\mathbf{R}) \pi(\mathbf{R}) d\mathbf{R} + \frac{\int \int \pi(\mathbf{R}) \hat{H}_V(\mathbf{R}, \mathbf{R}') \psi_V(\mathbf{R}') d\mathbf{R} d\mathbf{R}'}{\sqrt{\pi(\mathbf{R})}}}{\int \pi(\mathbf{R}) d\mathbf{R}} \quad (105)$$

which, by property 103, is the same as the mean for the unnormalized operator:

$$\langle \bar{O} \rangle = \langle \hat{O} \rangle \quad (106)$$

Operator $\bar{O}$ can be used as an unbiased estimator, even though statistical errors for $\bar{O}$ and $\hat{O}$ can be quite different. The goal of this kind of importance sampling is to reduce the fluctuations by construction of such an operator.

The implementation of the procedure requires the optimization of a set of parameters for the auxiliary trial wave function, $\Psi_V(\mathbf{R}, \Lambda_V)$, using the minimization functional,

$$\int \hat{H}_V(\mathbf{R}, \mathbf{R}') \Psi_V(\mathbf{R}, \Lambda_V) d\mathbf{R}' = -[\bar{O}(x) - \langle \bar{O} \rangle] \sqrt{\pi(\mathbf{R})} \quad (107)$$

After the parameters Λ_V are optimized, one can run a simulation to average $\bar{O}$, instead of $\hat{O}$. The choice of auxiliary Hamiltonian suggested by recent work [148] is

$$H_V(x, y) = -\frac{1}{2} \nabla_{\mathbf{R}}^2 + \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\pi(\mathbf{R})}} \nabla_{\mathbf{R}}^2 \sqrt{\pi(\mathbf{R})}. \quad (108)$$

Note that when Eq. 108 is applied to $\sqrt{\pi(\mathbf{R})}$, the $\mathbf{R}'$ integration vanishes by construction. The choice of auxiliary wave function is open, and an interesting observation is that minimization of the normalization factor of $\Psi_V(\mathbf{R})$, for any choice of auxiliary trial wave function, will reduce fluctuations in the auxiliary observable,

$$\sigma(\bar{O})^2 = \sigma(\hat{O})^2 - \frac{\left\langle \frac{\hat{O}(\mathbf{R}) \int \hat{H}(\mathbf{R}, \mathbf{R}') \Psi_V(\mathbf{R}') d\mathbf{R}'}{\sqrt{\pi(\mathbf{R})}} \right\rangle^2}{\left\langle \left[\frac{\int \hat{H}(\mathbf{R}, \mathbf{R}') \Psi_V(\mathbf{R}') d\mathbf{R}'}{\sqrt{\pi(\mathbf{R})}} \right]^2 \right\rangle} \quad (109)$$

because the second term on the right hand side of Eq. 109 always has a negative sign.

This variance reduction technique, applied to VMC and GFMC simulations, has achieved an order of magnitude reduction in computational effort [148]. It can also be used to calculate energy derivatives [149].

Part IV

Special topics

6 Fermion Nodes

As discussed briefly in chapter 5, the simulation of a quantum system without approximation, obtaining exact results other than the numerical integration scheme's associated error bar is still an open research topic. Several solutions have been proposed, but the challenge is to have a general method that scales favorably with system size.

For the ground state of a bosonic system, for which the wave function has the same sign everywhere, QMC provides an exact solution in a polynomial amount of computer time, i.e., is already a solved problem. The research in this field attempts to obtain an algorithm that has the same properties but that can treat wave functions that have both positive and negative regions, and therefore nodes, with the same favorable scaling.

Investigation of nodes has been pursued by [150, 151, 152, 153, 154] to understand the properties of the nodes of fermion wave functions.

The full nodal hyper-surfaces of a wave function, $\Psi(\mathbf{R})$, where $\mathbf{R}$ is a $3N$ dimensional vector and N is the number of fermions in the system is a $3N - 1$ dimensional function, $\eta(\mathbf{R})$. Of that function, symmetry requirements determine a $3N - 3$ dimensional surface, the *symmetry* sub-surface, $\sigma(\mathbf{R})$. This is unfortunate, because even though that $\sigma(\mathbf{R}) \subset \eta(\mathbf{R})$, the remainder of the nodal surface, the *peculiar* nodal surface, $\varpi(\mathbf{R})$ which is a function of the specific form of the nuclear and inter-electronic potential, is difficult to be known *a priori* for an arbitrary system. Note that $\sigma(\mathbf{R}) \cup \varpi(\mathbf{R}) = \eta(\mathbf{R})$.

Understanding nodal properties is important for further development of QMC methods: these shall be exploited for bypassing the node problem.

[151] discusses general properties of wave function nodes. General properties of nodes follow.

1. The *coincidence planes* $\pi(\mathbf{r}_i = \mathbf{r}_j)$, are located at nodes when the two electrons have the same spin, ie. $\delta_{\sigma_{ij}} = 1$. In more than 1 dimension, $\pi(\mathbf{R})$ is a scaffolding where the complex nodal surface passes through. Note that $\pi(\mathbf{R}) \subset \sigma(\mathbf{R})$.
2. The nodes possess all the symmetries of the ground state wave function.
3. The nodes of the many-body wave function are distinct from orbital nodes $\phi_i(\mathbf{r})$, see Sec. 3.2.
4. For degenerate wave functions, the node positions are arbitrary. For a p -fold degenerate energy level, one can pick $p - 1$ points in $\mathbf{R}$ and find a linear transformation for which the transformed wave functions vanish at all but one of these points.

5. A *nodal cell*, $\Omega(\mathbf{R})$ around a point $\mathbf{R}$ is defined as the set of points that can be reached from $\mathbf{R}$ without crossing a node. For potentials of our present interest, the ground state nodal cells have the *tiling-property*: any point $\mathbf{R}'$ not on the node is related by symmetry to a point in $\Omega(\mathbf{R})$. This implies that there is only one type of nodal cell: all other cells are copies that can be accessed by relabeling the particles. This property is the generalization to fermions of the theorem that the bosonic ground state is nodewave functionless.

[151] suggests that for DMC simulations benefit from the tiling property: one only needs to sample one nodal cell, because all the other cells are copies of the first. Any trial function resulting from a strictly mean field theory will satisfy the tiling property. Such as the local density approximation (LDA) wave functions.

[152] showed that simple HF wave functions for the first-row atoms were shown to have four nodal regions (two nodal surfaces intersecting) instead of two. This is attributed to factorizing the wave function into two distinct Slater determinants, $D^\uparrow$ and $D^\downarrow$, each composed of two surfaces, one for the $\uparrow$ and one for the $\downarrow$ electron, as discussed in Sec. 3.2.

Recently, after analysis of the wave functions for *He*, *Li* and *Be*, it was conjectured by [154], that the wave function can be factored as follows,

$$\Psi(\mathbf{R}) = N(\mathbf{R})e^{f(\mathbf{R})}, \quad (110)$$

where $N(\mathbf{R})$ is antisymmetric polynomial of finite order, and $f(\mathbf{R})$ is a positive definite function. A weaker conjecture is that N may not be a polynomial, but can be closely approximated by a lower-order antisymmetric polynomial. The variables in which N should be expanded are the inter-particle coordinates.

For example, for all ^3S states of two-electron atoms, the nodal factor $N(\mathbf{R})$ in Eq. 110 is,

$$N(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2) = \mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r}_2, \quad (111)$$

where $\mathbf{r}_1$ and $\mathbf{r}_2$ are the coordinates of the two electrons.

7 Treatment of heavy elements

So far, we have not discussed the applicability of QMC to systems with large atomic number. There is a steep computational scaling of QMC methods, with respect to the atomic number Z . The computational cost of QMC methods has been estimated to scale as $Z^{5.5-6.5}$ [155, 156]. This has motivated the replacement of the core electrons by ECPs. With this modification, the scaling with respect to atomic number is improved to $Z^{3.4}$ [155]. Other approaches involve the use of core-valence separation schemes[157] and the use of model potentials [158].

7.1 Effective core potentials

In the ECP method [159, 160, 161, 162, 163], the effect of the core electrons is simulated by an effective potential acting on the valence electrons. The effective Hamiltonian for these electrons is:

$$\mathcal{H}_{val} = \sum_i \frac{-Z_{eff}}{r_i} + \sum_{i<j} \frac{1}{r_{ij}} + \sum_i \mathcal{W}_i(\mathbf{r}), \quad (112)$$

where i and j designate the valence electrons, Z_{eff} is the effective nuclear charge in the absence of core electrons, and $\mathcal{W}$ is the pseudo-potential operator. The latter can be written,

$$\mathcal{W}(\mathbf{r}) = \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{W}_l(\mathbf{r}) \sum_m |lm\rangle\langle lm|, \quad (113)$$

where l and m are the angular momentum and magnetic quantum numbers. The projection operator $\sum_m |lm\rangle\langle lm|$, connects the pseudo-potential with the one-electron valence functions. A common approximation to this equation is to assume that the angular momentum components of the pseudo-potential, $w_l(\mathbf{r})$ do not depend on l when $l > L$, the angular momentum of the core. This approximation leads to the expression

$$\mathcal{W}(\mathbf{r}) = \mathcal{W}_{L+1}(\mathbf{r}) + \sum_{l=0}^L (\mathcal{W}_l(\mathbf{r}) - \mathcal{W}_{L+1}(\mathbf{r})) \sum_m |lm\rangle\langle lm|. \quad (114)$$

The operator (114) can be applied to a valence orbital, i.e., pseudo-orbital, $\phi_l(\mathbf{r})$. This function is usually represented by a polynomial expansion for distances less than a cutoff radius, $r < r_c$, and by a fit to the all-electron orbital for $r > r_c$.

Rapid fluctuations in the potential terms can cause the first order approximation of Eq. 72 to break down, therefore, seeking a slowly varying form of ECP is relevant to QMC simulations. [164] proposed the use of norm-conserving soft ECPs for QMC. Soft ECPs derive their name from the property of being finite at the nucleus, this leads to a pseudo-orbital with no singularities at the origin in the kinetic energy. The associated effective potential has no discontinuities or divergences.

7.2 Embedding methods

A commonly used approach in wave function based methods, is to use embedding schemes, in which a region of high interest of a large system is treated by an accurate procedure, and the remainder is described by a less accurate method. Recent work [165] has extended the methodology to QMC methods. In this approach, a mean field calculation, for example HF, is performed for the whole system. An electron localization procedure is performed, the orbitals to

be correlated are chosen and separated from the remaining core orbitals. An effective Coloumb and exchange potential is constructed, $\hat{V}_E$, which is added to the standard Hamiltonian of Eq. 1 to construct an effective Hamiltonian, $\hat{H}_E$, that then is used in QMC calculations. Localization procedures similar to those required for ECPs are needed for representing the effect of non local terms.

The effective Hamiltonian, $\hat{H}_E$, takes the form,

$$\hat{H}_E = \hat{H}_{int} + \hat{V}_{ext} + \hat{J}_{ext} + \hat{K}_{ext} + \hat{S}_{ext} \quad (115)$$

where $\hat{H}_{int}$ is the Hamiltonian for the QMC active region, $\hat{V}_{ext}$ is the Coloumb potential exerted by the external nuclei, $\hat{J}_{ext}$ represents the Coloumb repulsions, The term $\hat{K}_{ext}$ represents the exchange interactions, and $\hat{S}_{ext}$ is a shift operator that prevents the wave function to be expanded into core orbitals, ϕ_c , by shifting their energy to infinity, and is given by

$$\hat{S}_{ext} = \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} \lambda \sum_{\alpha}^{int} \sum_{\beta}^{ext} |\phi_p(\mathbf{r})\rangle \langle \phi_p(\mathbf{r})| d\mathbf{r}. \quad (116)$$

Here λ is an effective orbital coupling constant that is derived from considering single and double excitations into core and virtual orbitals of the system. The Coloumb term, $\hat{J}_{ext}$, and the external Coloumb potential, $\hat{V}_{ext}$, are local potentials, and can be evaluated within QMC without further approximation. The remaining terms require localization approximations that are discussed in detail in the original work.

8 Other Properties

8.1 Exact wave function and quantities that do not commute with the Hamiltonian

Properties related to a trial wave function $\Psi_T(\mathbf{R})$, are readily available in VMC calculations [166]. In this case, expectation values are calculated from directly from Eqs. 16 and 17. The accuracy of the results obtained with VMC depend on the quality of $\Psi_T(\mathbf{R})$.

For obtaining expectation values of operators that do not commute with the Hamiltonian in an importance sampled PMC calculation, one needs to extract the exact distribution $\Psi^2(\mathbf{R})$ from the mixed distribution $f(\mathbf{R}) = \Psi(\mathbf{R})\Psi_T(\mathbf{R})$. The expectation values for an operator $\hat{O}$, $\langle \Psi(\mathbf{R}) | \hat{O} | \Psi_T(\mathbf{R}) \rangle$ and $\langle \Psi_T(\mathbf{R}) | \hat{O} | \Psi(\mathbf{R}) \rangle$ are different to each other. MC sampling requires knowledge of the exact ground state distribution: a mixed distribution does not suffice to obtain the exact answer.

If the operator $\hat{O}$ is a multiplicative operator, then the algorithms described in this section will be pertinent. Non-multiplicative operators, which are exemplified by forces in this chapter, are described in Sec. 8.2.

8.1.1 Extrapolation method

An approximate procedure for estimating the ground state distribution can be extrapolated from the mixed and VMC distributions. This procedure is valuable because no extra changes are needed to the canonical VMC and PMC algorithms. Being an approximate method, it can fail even in very simple cases [37], but also has provided very accurate results in more favorable cases [167]. The mixed estimator of a coordinate operator $\hat{O}$, is,

$$\langle \hat{O} \rangle_m = \frac{\int \Psi(\mathbf{R}) \hat{O} \Psi_T(\mathbf{R}) d\mathbf{R}}{\int \Psi(\mathbf{R}) \Psi_T(\mathbf{R}) d\mathbf{R}}, \quad (117)$$

to be distinguished from the pure estimator,

$$\langle \hat{O} \rangle_p = \frac{\int \Psi(\mathbf{R}) \hat{O} \Psi(\mathbf{R}) d\mathbf{R}}{\int \Psi(\mathbf{R}) \Psi(\mathbf{R}) d\mathbf{R}}. \quad (118)$$

We will label $\langle \hat{O} \rangle_v$ the VMC estimator of Eq. 16. $\langle \hat{O} \rangle_m$ can be rewritten in a Taylor series in the difference between the exact and approximate wave functions, $\delta\Psi \equiv \Psi(\mathbf{R}) - \Psi_T(\mathbf{R})$,

$$\langle \hat{O} \rangle_m = \langle \hat{O} \rangle_p + \int \Psi(\langle \hat{O} \rangle_p - \hat{O}(\mathbf{R})) \delta\Psi d\mathbf{R} + \mathcal{O}(\delta\Psi^2). \quad (119)$$

A similar expansion can be constructed for $\langle \hat{O} \rangle_v$,

$$\langle \hat{O} \rangle_v = \langle \hat{O} \rangle_p + 2 \int \Psi(\langle \hat{O} \rangle_p - \hat{O}(\mathbf{R})) \delta\Psi d\mathbf{R} + \mathcal{O}(\delta\Psi^2). \quad (120)$$

Combining Eqs. 119 and 120, we can arrive to an expression with a second order error,

$$\langle \hat{O} \rangle_e = 2\langle \hat{O} \rangle_m - \langle \hat{O} \rangle_v = \langle \hat{O} \rangle_p + \mathcal{O}(\delta\Psi^2), \quad (121)$$

where $\langle \hat{O} \rangle_e$ is an extrapolation estimate readily available from VMC and PMC calculations.

8.1.2 Future walking

The future walking method can be combined with any importance sampled PMC method that leads to a mixed distribution. If one multiplies both sides of Eq. 117 by the ratio $\Psi(\mathbf{R})/\Psi_T(\mathbf{R})$, one can recover Eq. 118. The ratio is obtained from the asymptotic population of descendants of a single walker [168].

A walker in $\mathbf{R}$ -space can be represented as a sum of eigenfunctions of $\hat{H}$,

$$\delta(\mathbf{R}' - \mathbf{R}) = \Psi(\mathbf{R}') \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} c_n(\mathbf{R}) \Psi_n(\mathbf{R}) \quad (122)$$

The coefficients $c_i(\mathbf{R})$ can be obtained by multiplying Eq. 122 by $\Psi(\mathbf{R}')/\Psi_T(\mathbf{R}')$ and integrating over $\mathbf{R}'$,

$$c_n(\mathbf{R}) = \int \delta(\mathbf{R}' - \mathbf{R}) \frac{\Psi(\mathbf{R}')}{\Psi_T(\mathbf{R}')} d\mathbf{R}' = \frac{\Psi(\mathbf{R})}{\Psi_T(\mathbf{R})} \quad (123)$$

Clearly, we want to know the contribution to the ground state wave function, $c_0(\mathbf{R})$ of the walker at $\mathbf{R}$. If propagated for sufficiently long time, all coefficients $c_i(\mathbf{R}) \neq c_0(\mathbf{R})$ for the random walker will vanish. This can be seen from the decay in τ of Eqs. 63 and 64.

If we define $P_\infty(\mathbf{R})$ to be the asymptotic population of walkers descended from a random walker at $\mathbf{R}$, we find,

$$P_\infty(\mathbf{R}) = \int c_0(\mathbf{R}) e^{-(E_0 - E_T)\tau} \Psi(\mathbf{R}') \Psi_T(\mathbf{R}') d\mathbf{R}' = \frac{\Psi(\mathbf{R})}{\Psi_T(\mathbf{R})} e^{-(E_0 - E_T)\tau} \langle \Psi(\mathbf{R}) | \Psi_T(\mathbf{R}) \rangle \quad (124)$$

For obtaining $P_\infty(\mathbf{R})$ in a PMC algorithm, one needs to keep a list of all the descendants of each walker $\mathbf{R}_i$ at each time step τ_j . The number of steps for which one requires to keep track of the descendants, N_d , is a critical parameter. The statistical error of the asymptotic walker population grows in the limit $N_d \rightarrow \infty$, and if only few steps are used, a bias is encountered by non-vanishing contributions from excited states $c_i(\mathbf{R}) \neq c_0(\mathbf{R})$. Efficient algorithms for keeping track of the number of descendants can be found in the literature [167, 169, 170, 84, 168, 9, 171].

The wave function overlap with the ground state can also be obtained with these methods, as shown by [172]. These methods have been applied for obtaining dipole moments [173], transition dipole moments [174] and oscillator strengths [175], among other applications.

Other methods for obtaining the exact distribution that are not discussed here for reasons of space are bilinear methods [176], and time correlation methods [177].

8.2 Force calculation

Most QMC applications have been within the Born-Oppenheimer (BO) [178] approximation. In this approximation, the nuclear coordinates $\mathcal{R}$ are fixed at a certain position during the calculation⁹. Therefore, the wave function and energy depends parametrically on the nuclear coordinates, $E(\mathcal{R})$ and $\Psi(\mathbf{R}, \mathcal{R})$. We will omit this parametric dependence for the remainder of the discussion, and simplify the symbols to E and $\Psi(\mathbf{R})$, when appropriate.

Forces are derivatives of the energy with respect to nuclear displacements,

$$F(\mathcal{R}) = \nabla_{\mathcal{R}} E(\mathcal{R}) \quad (125)$$

Because the stochastic nature of the algorithm, obtaining forces in QMC is a difficult task. Generally, QMC calculations at critical points, e.g., equilibrium

⁹The QMC method can be used for calculations without the BO approximation, but so far the applications have been to nodeless systems, such as H_2 [179].

and reaction barrier geometries have been carried out , in which the geometries are obtained with a different quantum chemical method such as density functional theory (DFT) [180], or wave function methods. Whereas DFT and wave function methods use the Hellman-Feynman theorem for the calculation of forces, a straightforward application of the theorem in QMC leads to estimators with very large variance.

8.2.1 Correlated sampling

An efficient approach for force calculation is the use of correlated sampling, which is a MC method that uses correlation between similar observations to reduce the statistical error of the sampling. If one were to represent Eq. 125 in a finite difference scheme for evaluating a derivative along $\mathbf{r}_d$,

$$\frac{\partial E}{\partial \mathbf{r}_d} \approx \frac{E(\mathcal{R} + \mathbf{r}_d) - E(\mathcal{R})}{\mathbf{r}_d}, \quad (126)$$

then one obtains an approximate energy derivative along the $\mathbf{r}_d$. If two separate calculations are carried out, with a statistical error of the energies of σ_E , the statistical error for the difference σ_d is approximately,

$$\sigma_d \approx \frac{\sigma_E}{\mathbf{r}_d}, \quad (127)$$

One can see that because $\mathbf{r}_d$ is a vector of a small perturbation, of ≈ 0.01 a.u., that the statistical error of the difference will be several times higher than the statistical error of the energies. If $\mathbf{r}_d$ is sufficiently small, a single random walk can be performed, while evaluating the energy at the original and perturbed geometries, $E[\Psi(\mathcal{R})]$ and $E[\Psi(\mathcal{R} + \mathbf{r}_d)]$. In this case, both the primary ($\mathcal{R}$) and secondary ($\mathcal{R}$) walks will be correlated, and therefore present lower variance than uncorrelated random walks.

If correlated sampling is used for forces in a PMC algorithm, it was recently proposed [181] to use expressions including branching factors $B(\mathbf{R})$, re-optimizing the parameters of the wave function Λ for each perturbed geometry, and perform additional coordinate transformations. Practical implementations of the correlated sampling method for derivatives are described in detail in [182] and [181].

8.2.2 Analytic derivative methods

The calculation of analytic derivative estimators is a costly process, both for wave function based methods, and for QMC methods. Fortunately, in QMC one needs not to evaluate derivatives at each step, but rather sample points more sporadically, both for reducing computer time and serial correlation.

The local energy estimator for a DMC mixed distribution is,

$$E_o = \langle E_L \rangle = \frac{\int \Psi_o(\mathbf{R}) E_L(\mathbf{R}) \Psi_T(\mathbf{R}) d\mathbf{R}}{\int \Psi_o(\mathbf{R}) \Psi_T(\mathbf{R}) d\mathbf{R}}. \quad (128)$$

The gradient of expression 128 involves derivatives of the unknown exact wave function $\Psi_o(\mathbf{R})$, and the trial wave function $\Psi_T(\mathbf{R})$. Derivatives of $\Psi_o(\mathbf{R})$ have to be obtained with a method devised for sampling operators that do not commute with the Hamiltonian, which are described in Sec. 8.1. This can lead to an exact estimator for the derivative, but with the added computational complexity of those methods. Therefore, a simple approximation can be used, replacing the derivatives of $\Psi_o(\mathbf{R})$ with those of $\Psi_T(\mathbf{R})$ to obtain,

$$\nabla_{\mathcal{R}} E_o \approx \langle \nabla_{\mathcal{R}} E_L(\mathbf{R}) \rangle + 2 \langle E_L \frac{\nabla_{\mathcal{R}} \Psi_T(\mathbf{R})}{\Psi_T(\mathbf{R})} \rangle - 2 E_o \langle \frac{\nabla_{\mathcal{R}} \Psi_T(\mathbf{R})}{\Psi_T(\mathbf{R})} \rangle. \quad (129)$$

The derivatives of $\Psi_T(\mathbf{R})$ are readily obtainable from the known analytic expression of $\Psi_T(\mathbf{R})$.

The expression for the exact derivative involves the cumulative weight of configuration $\mathbf{R}_i$ at time step s , $\mathbf{R}_i^s$,

$$\bar{B}_i = \prod_{s_o}^s B(\mathbf{R}_i^s), \quad (130)$$

where $s - s_o$ is the number of generations for the accumulation of the cumulative weight, and $B(\mathbf{R}_i^s)$ is the PMC branching factor of Eqs. 53 and 83. The energy expression using cumulative weights is,

$$E_o = \frac{\int \Psi_T(\mathbf{R})^2 \bar{B}(\mathbf{R}) E_L(\mathbf{R}) d\mathbf{R}}{\int \Psi_T(\mathbf{R})^2 \bar{B}(\mathbf{R}) d\mathbf{R}} \quad (131)$$

The energy derivative of expression 131 leads to the following derivative expression,

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_{\mathcal{R}} E_o &= \langle \nabla_{\mathcal{R}} E_L(\mathbf{R}) \rangle + 2 \langle E_L(\mathbf{R}) \frac{\nabla_{\mathcal{R}} \Psi_T(\mathbf{R})}{\Psi_T(\mathbf{R})} \rangle - 2 E_o \langle \frac{\nabla_{\mathcal{R}} \Psi_T(\mathbf{R})}{\Psi_T(\mathbf{R})} \rangle \\ &+ \langle E_L(\mathbf{R}) \frac{\nabla_{\mathcal{R}} \bar{B}(\mathbf{R})}{\bar{B}(\mathbf{R})} \rangle - E_o \langle \frac{\nabla_{\mathcal{R}} \bar{B}(\mathbf{R})}{\bar{B}(\mathbf{R})} \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (132)$$

Analytic energy derivatives have been applied to H_2 [169], LiH and CuH [183]. Higher order derivatives can be obtained as well. Details on the former can be found on refs. [184] and [185].

8.2.3 Hellman-Feynman derivatives and the zero variance theorem

The Hellman-Feynman theorem states that the forces can be obtained by looking at the value of the gradient of the potential,

$$\langle \nabla_{\mathcal{R}} E_o \rangle = - \frac{\int \Psi^2(\mathbf{R}) \nabla_{\mathcal{R}} V(\mathbf{R}) d\mathbf{R}}{\int \Psi^2(\mathbf{R}) d\mathbf{R}}, \quad (133)$$

where $V(\mathbf{R})$ is the Coloumb potential for the system. A QMC estimator of the Hellman-Feynman forces, $\mathbf{F}_{HF} \equiv -\nabla_{\mathcal{R}} V(\mathbf{R})$, can be constructed, but it has infinite variance. This comes from the fact that at short electron-nucleus distances, $\mathbf{r}_{iN}$, the force behaves as $\mathbf{F}_{HF} \approx \frac{1}{\mathbf{r}_{iN}^2}$, therefore the variance associated with $\mathbf{F}_{HF}$ depends on $\langle \mathbf{F}_{HF}^2 \rangle$, which is infinite. Furthermore, the Hellman-Feynman theorem only holds for exact wave functions, and basis set errors need to be accounted for [186]. Also, the fixed-node approximation introduces an extra requirement on the nodal surface. The former has to be independent of the position of the nuclei, or it has to be the exact one. An elaborate discussion of this issue can be found in [187] and [188].

A proposed solution to the infinite variance problem is to evaluate the forces at a cutoff distance close to the origin, and then extrapolation to a cutoff distance of zero [184]. This has the problem that the extrapolation procedure is difficult due to the increase of variance as the cutoff values decrease.

As discussed in Sec. 5.8, renormalized operators can be obtained, in such a way that they have the same expectation value, but lower variance. Recently [149], a renormalized operator was introduced,

$$\bar{\mathbf{F}}_{HF} = \mathbf{F}_{HF} + \left[\frac{\hat{H}_V \Psi_V(\mathbf{R})}{\Psi_V(\mathbf{R})} - \frac{\hat{H}_V \Psi_T(\mathbf{R})}{\Psi_T(\mathbf{R})} \right] \frac{\Psi_V(\mathbf{R})}{\Psi_T(\mathbf{R})}. \quad (134)$$

Here, $\Psi_V(\mathbf{R})$ are an auxiliary wave function and $\hat{H}_V$ is an auxiliary Hamiltonian. The variance of operator 134 can be shown to be finite, and therefore smaller than $\mathbf{F}_{HF}$. The form of $\Psi_V(\mathbf{R})$ proposed by [149] is a simple form that cancels the singularities of the force in the case of a diatomic molecule. Nevertheless, general forms of the auxiliary wave function can be constructed.

Variational Monte Carlo dynamics

Correlated sampling can be combined with a fictitious Lagrangian technique, similar to that developed by [189] in a way first proposed by [190] for geometry optimization. In this approach, the expectation value of the Hamiltonian is treated as a functional of the nuclear positions and the correlation parameters,

$$\langle \hat{H} \rangle = \frac{\langle \Psi | \hat{H} | \Psi \rangle}{\langle \Psi | \Psi \rangle} = E[\{\Lambda\}, \{\mathcal{R}\}] \quad (135)$$

With the previous functional, a fictitious Lagrangian can be constructed of the form,

$$L = \sum_{\alpha} \frac{1}{2} \mu_{\alpha} \dot{\lambda}_{\alpha}^2 + \sum_I \frac{1}{2} M_I \dot{\mathcal{R}}_I^2 - E[\{\Lambda\}, \{\mathcal{R}\}] \quad (136)$$

where M_I are the nuclear masses and μ_{α} are the fictitious masses for the variational parameters, λ_{α} . The modified Euler-Lagrange equations can be used for generating dynamics for the sets of parameters, $\{\mathcal{R}\}$ and $\{\Lambda\}$,

$$M_I \mathcal{R}_I'' = \nabla_{R_I} E, \quad (137)$$

$$\mu_\alpha \lambda_\alpha'' = \frac{\partial E}{\partial \lambda_\alpha}, \quad (138)$$

A dissipative transformation of equations 137 and 138, where the masses M_I and μ_α are replaced by damped masses $\widetilde{M}_I$ and $\widetilde{\mu}_\alpha$ can be used for geometry optimization. A more elaborate approach that attempts to include quantum effects in the dynamics is described in [191].

To conclude, a method that is not described here due to reasons of space and that needs to be explored further, is the generalized re-weighting method [192].

References

- [1] D. M. Benoit and D. C. Clary, J. Chem. Phys. **113**, 5193 (2000).
- [2] Y. Kwon, P. Huang, M. V. Patel, D. Blume, and K. B. Whaley, J. Chem. Phys. **113**, 6469 (2000).
- [3] D. C. Clary, J. Chem. Phys., **114**, 9725 (2001).
- [4] A. Viel and K. B. Whaley, J. Chem. Phys. **115**, 10186 (2001).
- [5] D. M. Ceperley and B. J. Alder, Phys. Rev. Lett. **45**, 566 (1980).
- [6] M. Foulkes, L. Mitas, R. Needs, and G. Rajagopal, Rev. Mod. Phys. **73**, 33 (2001).
- [7] R. B. Wiringa, S. C. Pieper, J. Carlson, and V. R. Pandharipande, Phys. Rev. C **62**, 14001 (2000).
- [8] S. C. Pieper and R. B. Wiringa, Annu. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci **51**, 53 (2001).
- [9] B. L. Hammond, W. A. Lester, Jr., and P. J. Reynolds, *Monte Carlo Methods in Ab Initio Quantum Chemistry* (World Scientific, Singapore, 1994).
- [10] K. E. Schmidt, in *Conference on Models and Methods in Few Body Physics* (Lisbon, 1986).
- [11] W. A. Lester, Jr. and B. L. Hammond, Annu. Rev. Phys. Chem. **41**, 283 (1990).
- [12] D. M. Ceperley and L. Mitas, in *New Methods in Computational Quantum Mechanics*, edited by I. Prigogine and S. A. Rice (John Wiley and Sons, 1996), vol. XCIII of *Adv. Chem. Phys.*

- [13] P. H. Acioli, J. of Mol. Struct. (Theochem) **394**, 75 (1997).
- [14] D. Bressanini and P. J. Reynolds, Adv. Chem. Phys. **105**, 37 (1998).
- [15] L. Mitas, in *Quantum Monte Carlo Methods in Physics and Chemistry*, edited by M. P. Nightingale and C. J. Umrigar (Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1998), vol. 525, p. 247.
- [16] J. B. Anderson, in *Reviews in Computational Chemistry*, edited by K. B. Lipkowitz and D. B. Boyd (John Wiley and Sons, New York, 1999), vol. 13, p. 133.
- [17] A. Lüchow and J. B. Anderson, Ann. Rev. Phys. Chem. **51**, 501 (2000).
- [18] S. E. Koonin and D. C. Meredith, *Computational physics, FORTRAN version* (Addison Wesley, 1995), 3rd ed.
- [19] H. Gould and J. Tobochnik, *An Introduction to Computer simulation Methods: Applications to Physical Systems* (Addison Wesley, 1996), 2nd ed.
- [20] J. M. Thijssen, *Computational Physics* (Cambridge Univ. Press, 1999), 1st ed.
- [21] C. W. Greeff, B. L. Hammond, and W. A. Lester, Jr., J. Chem. Phys. **104**, 1973 (1996).
- [22] A. S. Sokolova, Chem. Phys. Lett. **320**, 421 (2000).
- [23] C. W. Greeff and W. A. Lester, Jr., J. Chem. Phys. **106**, 6412 (1997).
- [24] H.-J. Flad, A. Savin, and M. Schultheiss, Chem. Phys. Lett. **222**, 274 (1994).
- [25] J. C. Grossman and L. Mitas, Phys. Rev. Lett. **74**, 1323 (1995).
- [26] H.-J. Flad and M. Dolg, J. Chem. Phys. **107**, 7951 (1997).
- [27] C. Filippi and C. J. Umrigar, J. Chem. Phys. **105**, 213 (1996).
- [28] R. N. Barnett, Z. Sun, and W. A. Lester, Jr., J. Chem. Phys. **114**, 2013 (2001), J. Chem. Phys.
- [29] H.-J. Flad, M. Caffarel, and A. Savin, in *Recent Advances in Quantum Monte Carlo Methods*, edited by W. A. Lester, Jr. (Wold Scientific, 1997), chap. 5, pp. 73–98.
- [30] J. C. Grossman, W. A. Lester, Jr., and S. G. Louie, J. Am. Chem. Soc. **122**, 703 (2000).
- [31] I. V. Ovcharenko, W. A. Lester, Jr., C. Xiao, and F. Hagelberg, J. Chem. Phys. **114**, 9028 (2001).
- [32] D. M. Charutz and D. Neuhauser, J. Chem. Phys. **102**, 4495 (1995).

- [33] N. Rom., D. M. Charutz, and D. Neuhauser, Chem. Phys. Lett. **270**, 382 (1997).
- [34] R. Baer, M. Head-Gordon, and D. Neuhauser, J. Chem. Phys. **109**, 6219 (1998).
- [35] R. Baer and D. Neuhauser, J. Chem. Phys. **112**, 1679 (2000).
- [36] D. M. Ceperley, Rev. of Mod. Phys. **67**(2), 279 (1995).
- [37] A. Sarsa, K. E. Schmidt, and W. R. Magro, J. Chem. Phys. **113**, 1366 (2000).
- [38] N. Metropolis and S. Ulam, J. Amer. Statist. Assoc. **44**, 335 (1949).
- [39] Albert Einstein, *Investigations in the theory of Brownian Motion* (Metheun & Co. Ltd, 1926), english translation of Einstein's original paper.
- [40] R. Courant, K. O. Friedrichs, and H. Lewy, Math. Ann. **100**, 32 (1928).
- [41] M. Head-Gordon, J. Phys. Chem. **100**, 13213 (1996).
- [42] K. Raghavachari and J. B. Anderson, J. Phys. Chem. **100**, 12960 (1996).
- [43] E. Cancès, M. Defranceschi, W. Kutzelnigg, C. Le Bris, and Y. Maday, in *Computational Chemistry*, edited by C. Le Bris (Elsevier, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, 2002), vol. VII of *Handbook of Numerical Analysis*, chap. 1, first. ed.
- [44] P.-O. Löwdin, Adv. Chem. Phys. **2**, 207 (1959).
- [45] G. Senatore and N. H. March, Rev. Mod. Phys. **66**, 445 (1994).
- [46] D. Watson, M. Dunn, T. C. Germann, D. R. Herschbach, and D. Z. Goodson, in *New Methods in Quantum Theory*, edited by C. A. Tsipis, V. S. Popov, D. R. Herschbach, and J. Avery (Kluwer Academic, Dordrecht, 1996), p. 83.
- [47] D. A. Mazziotti, Phys. Rev. A **57**, 4219 (1998).
- [48] P. V. R. Schleyer, N. L. Allinger, T. Clark, J. Gasteiger, P. A. Kollman, H. F. Schaefer III, and P. R. Schreiner, eds., *The Encyclopedia of Computational Chemistry* (John Wiley & Sons, Chichester, 1998).
- [49] M. D. Donsker and M. Kac, J. Res. Nat. Bur. Standards **44**(50), 551 (1950).
- [50] M. H. Kalos, Phys. Rev. **68**(4) (1962).
- [51] H. Hellman, *Einführung in die Quanten Theorie* (Deuticke, 1937).
- [52] R. P. Feynmann, Phys. Rev. **56**, 340 (1939).

- [53] M. Weissbluth, *Atoms and molecules* (Academic Press, New York, 1978), see pages 570-572.
- [54] A. A. Frost, R. E. Kellog, and E. A. Curtis, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **32**, 313 (1960).
- [55] T. Kato, *Comm. in Pure. and Appl. Math.* **10**, 151 (1957).
- [56] C. R. Meyers, C. J. Umrigar, J. P. Sethna, and J. D. Morgan, *Phys. Rev. A* **44**, 5537 (1991).
- [57] M. M. Morell, R. G. Parr, and M. Levy, *J. Chem. Phys.* **62**, 549 (1975).
- [58] E. R. Davidson, *Reduced Density Matrices in Quantum Chemistry* (Acad. Press, New York, 1976).
- [59] H. H. James and A. S. Coolidge, *Phys. Rev.* **51**, 860 (1937).
- [60] K. McDowell, *Int. J. Quant. Chem: Quant. Chem. Symp.* **15**, 177 (1981).
- [61] W. F. Bauer, *J. Soc. Indst. Appl. Math.* **6**(4), 438 (1958), a very well described introduction to MC methods by an applied mathematician. Cites the Courant and Levy 1928 paper.
- [62] J. M. Hammersley and D. C. Handscomb, *Monte Carlo Methods* (Methuen, London, 1964).
- [63] John H. Halton, *SIAM Review* **12**(1), 1 (1970).
- [64] W. W. Wood and J. J. Erpenbeck, *Ann. Rev. Phys. Chem.* **27**, 319 (1976).
- [65] M. H. Kalos and P. A. Whitlock, *Monte Carlo Methods Volume 1: Basics* (Wiley, N.Y., 1986).
- [66] G. S. Fishman, *Monte Carlo: Concepts, Algorithms and Applications* (Springer-Verlag, 1996), 1st ed.
- [67] I. M. Sobol, *A Primer for the Monte Carlo Method* (CRC Press, 1994).
- [68] I. Manno, *Introduction to the Monte-Carlo Method* (Akademiai Kiado, Budapest, 1999).
- [69] A. Doucet, N. de Freitas, N. Gordon, and A. Smith, eds., *Sequential Monte Carlo methods in practice* (Springer Verlag, New York, 2001).
- [70] J. S. Liu, *Monte Carlo Strategies in Scientific Computing* (Springer Verlag, New York, 2001).
- [71] N. Metropolis, A. W. Rosenbluth, M. N. Rosenbluth, N. M. Teller, and E. Teller, *J. Chem. Phys.* **21**, 1087 (1953).
- [72] D. Bressanini and P. J. Reynolds, *Adv. Chem. Phys.* **105**, 37 (1998).

- [73] M. H. Kalos, D. Levesque, and L. Verlet, Phys. Rev. A **9**, 2178 (1974).
- [74] D. Ceperley, G. V. Chester, and M. H. Kalos, Phys. Rev. B. **16**, 3081 (1977).
- [75] M. Rao and B. J. Berne, J. Chem. Phys. **71**, 129 (1979).
- [76] C. Pangali, M. Rao, and B. J. Berne, Mol. Phys. **37**, 1773 (1979).
- [77] J. B. Anderson, J. Chem. Phys. **73**(8), 3897 (1980).
- [78] M. Dewing, J. Chem. Phys. **113**, 5123 (2000).
- [79] M. L. Stedman, W. M. C. Fowlkes, and M. Nekovee, J. Chem. Phys. **109**, 2630 (1998).
- [80] C. J. Umrigar, Phys. Rev. Lett. **71**, 408 (1993).
- [81] Z. Sun, M. M. Soto, and W. A. Lester, Jr., J. Chem. Phys. **100**, 1278 (1994).
- [82] D. Bressanini and P. J. Reynolds, J. Chem. Phys. **111**, 6180 (1999).
- [83] S. M. Rothstein and J. Vbrik, J. Comp. Phys. **74**, 127 (1988).
- [84] M. Caffarel and P. Claverie, J. Chem. Phys. **88**, 1088 (1988).
- [85] S.-Y. Huang, Z. Sun, and W. A. Lester, Jr., J. Chem. Phys. **92**, 597 (1990).
- [86] S. A. Alexander and R. L. Coldwell, Int. J. Quant. Chem. **63**, 1001 (1997).
- [87] L. Bertini, D. Bressanini, M. Mella, and G. Morosi, Int. J. of Quant. Chem. **74**, 23 (1999).
- [88] S. Manten and A. Lűchow, J. Chem. Phys. **115**, 5362 (2001).
- [89] A. Bijl, Physica **7**, 869 (1940).
- [90] R. B. Dingle, Phil. Mag. **40**, 573 (1949).
- [91] R. Jastrow, Phys. Rev. **98**, 1479 (1955).
- [92] C. Huang, C. J. Umrigar, and M. P. Nightingale, J. Chem. Phys. **107**, 3007 (1997).
- [93] R. P. Feynmann and M. Cohen, Phys. Rev. **102**, 1189 (1956).
- [94] K. E. Schmidt and J. W. Moskowitz, J. Chem. Phys. **93**(4172) (1990).
- [95] Y. Kwon, D. M. Ceperley, and R. M. Martin, Phys. Rev. B. **48**, 12037 (1993).
- [96] Y. Kwon, D. M. Ceperley, and R. M. Martin, Phys. Rev. B. **58**, 6800 (1998).
- [97] K. Schmidt, M. H. Kalos, M.l A. Lee, and G. V. Chester, Phys. Rev. Lett. **45**, 573 (1980).

- [98] J. Casulleras and J. Boronat, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 3121 (2000).
- [99] V. R. Pandharipande and N. Itoh, Phys. Rev. A **8**, 2564 (1973).
- [100] V. R. Pandharipande, S. C. Pieper, and R. B. Wiringa, Phys. Rev. B **34**, 4571 (1986).
- [101] S. F. Boys and N. C. Handy, Proc. R. Soc. London Ser. A **310**, 63 (1969).
- [102] C. J. Umrigar, K. G. Wilson, and J. W. Wilkins, Phys. Rev. Lett. **60**, 1719 (1988).
- [103] Z. Sun, R. N. Barnett, and W. A. Lester, Jr., Chem. Phys. Lett. **195**, 365 (1992).
- [104] R. N. Barnett, Z. Sun, and W. A. Lester, Jr., Chem. Phys. Lett. **273**, 321 (1997).
- [105] H. Bueckert, S. M. Rothstein, and J. Vrbik, Can. J. Chem. **70**, 366 (1992).
- [106] A. Lüchow and J. B. Anderson, J. Chem. Phys. **105**, 7573 (1996).
- [107] H. Huang and Z. Cao, J. Chem. Phys. **104**, 1 (1996).
- [108] H. Huang, Q. Xie, Z. Cao, Z. Li, Z. Yue, and L. Ming, J. Chem. Phys. **110**, 3703 (1999).
- [109] X. Lin, H. Zhang, and A. M. Rappe, J. Chem. Phys. **112**, 2650 (2000).
- [110] H. Conroy, J. Chem. Phys. **41**, 1331 (1964).
- [111] Z. Sun, S.-Y. Huang, R. N. Barnett, and W. A. Lester, Jr., J. Chem. Phys. **93**, 5 (1990).
- [112] M. P. Nightingale and C. J. Umrigar, in *Recent Advances in Quantum Monte Carlo Methods*, edited by W. A. Lester, Jr. (World Scientific, 1997), chap. 12, pp. 201–227.
- [113] M. Snajdr, J. R. Dwyer, and S. M. Rothstein, J. Chem. Phys. **111**, 9971 (1999).
- [114] C. Filippi and S. Fahy, J. Chem. Phys. **112**, 3532 (2000).
- [115] M. Hornik, M. Snajdr, and S. M. Rothstein, J. Chem. Phys. **113**, 3496 (2000).
- [116] J. H. Hetherington, Phys. Rev. A. **30**, 2713 (1984).
- [117] S. A. Chin, Phys. Rev. A **42**, 6991 (1990).
- [118] N. J. Cerf and O. C. Martin, Int. J. of Mod. Phys. **6**, 693 (1995).
- [119] Y. Iba, Trans. Japanese Soc. of Art. Int. pp. 279–286 (2000).
- [120] R. Assaraf, M. Caffarel, and A. Khelif, Phys. Rev. E **61**, 4566 (2000).

- [121] F. B. Jr. and R. Fuller, *Mathematics of Classical and Quantum Physics* (Dover, 1992).
- [122] D. M. Ceperley and M. H. Kalos, in *Monte Carlo Methods in Statistical Physics*, edited by K. Binder (Springer-Verlag, New York, 1986), 2nd ed.
- [123] J. B. Anderson, J. Chem. Phys. **65**(10), 4121 (1976).
- [124] P. J. Reynolds, D. M. Ceperley, B. Alder, and W. A. Lester, Jr., J. Chem. Phys. **77**, 5593 (1982).
- [125] S. A. Chin, Phys. Lett. A. **226**, 344 (1997).
- [126] H. A. Forbert and S. A. Chin, Int.J.Mod.Phys. B **15**, 1752 (2001).
- [127] S. Sorella, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 4558 (1998).
- [128] M. C. Buonaura and S. Sorella, Phys. Rev. B **61**, 2559 (1998).
- [129] S. Sorella and L. Capriotti, Phys. Rev. B **61**, 2599 (2000).
- [130] M. F. DePasquale, S. M. Rothstein, and J. Vrbik, J. Chem. Phys. **89**, 3629 (1988).
- [131] C. J. Umrigar, M. P. Nightingale, and K. J. Runge, J. Chem. Phys. **99**, 2865 (1993).
- [132] D. M. Ceperley, J. Comp. Phys. **51**, 404 (1983).
- [133] D. W. Skinner, J. W. Moskowitz, M. A. Lee, K. E. Schmidt, and P. A. Whitlock, J. Chem. Phys. **83**, 4668 (1985).
- [134] K. E. Schmidt and J. W. Moskowitz, J. Stat. Phys. **43**, 1027 (1986).
- [135] D. M. Arnow, M. H. Kalos, M. A. Lee, and K. E. Schmidt, J. Chem. Phys. **77**, 5562 (1982).
- [136] D. M. Ceperley and B. J. Alder, J. Chem. Phys. **81**, 5833 (1984).
- [137] S. Zhang and M. H. Kalos, Phys. Rev. Lett. **67**, 3074 (1991).
- [138] J. B. Anderson, C. A. Traynor, and B. M. Boghosian, J. Chem. Phys. **95**, 7418 (1991).
- [139] Z. Liu, S. Zhang, and M. H. Kalos, Phys. Rev. E. **50**, 3220 (1994).
- [140] M. H. Kalos and K. E. Schmidt, J. Stat. Phys. **89**, 425 (1997).
- [141] M. H. Kalos and F. Pederiva, in *Quantum Monte Carlo Methods in Physics and Chemistry*, edited by M. P. Nightingale and C. J. Umrigar (Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1998), vol. 525, pp. 263–286.
- [142] F. Pederiva and M. H. Kalos, Comp. Phys. Comm. **122**, 445 (1999).

- [143] M. H. Kalos and F. Pederiva, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 3547 (2000).
- [144] M. H. Kalos and F. Pederiva, Physica A **279**, 236 (2000).
- [145] A. Bhattacharya and J. B. Anderson, Phys. Rev. A **49**, 2441 (1994).
- [146] A. Bhattacharya and J. B. Anderson, J. Chem. Phys. **100**, 8999 (1994).
- [147] J. B. Anderson, J. Chem. Phys. **115**, 4546 (2001).
- [148] R. Assaraf and M. Caffarel, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 4682 (1999).
- [149] R. Assaraf and M. Caffarel, J. Chem. Phys. **113**, 4028 (2000).
- [150] M. Caffarel, P. Claverie, C. Mijoule, J. Andzelm, and D. R. Salahub, J. Chem. Phys. **90**, 990 (1989).
- [151] D. M. Ceperley, J. Stat. Phys. **63**, 1237 (1991).
- [152] W. A. Glauser, W. R. Brown, W. A. Lester, Jr., D. Bressanini, B. L. Hammond, and M. L. Koszykowski, J. Chem. Phys. **97**, 9200 (1992).
- [153] M. Caffarel, X. Krokidis, and C. Mijoule, Europhys. Lett. **7**, 581 (1992).
- [154] D. Bressanini, D. M. Ceperley, and P. J. Reynolds, in *Recent Advances in Quantum Monte Carlo Methods, Part II*, edited by S. M. Rothstein, W. A. Lester, Jr., and S. Tanaka (World Scientific, Singapore, 2002).
- [155] B. L. Hammond, P. J. Reynolds, and W. A. Lester, Jr., J. Chem. Phys. **87**, 1130 (1987).
- [156] D. M. Ceperley, J. Stat. Phys. **43**, 815 (1986).
- [157] V. N. Staroverov, P. Langfelder, and S.M. Rothstein, J. Chem. Phys. **108**, 2873 (1998).
- [158] T. Yoshida and K. Iguchi, J. Chem. Phys. **88**, 1032 (1988).
- [159] L. Szasz, *Pseudopotential Theory of Atoms and Molecules* (Wiley, New York, 1985).
- [160] M. Krauss and W. J. Stevens., Annu. Rev. Phys. Chem. p. 357 (1984).
- [161] P. A. Christiansen, W. C. Ermler, and K. S. Pitzer, Annu. Rev. Phys. Chem. **35**, 357 (1984).
- [162] K. Balasubramanian and K.S. Pitzer, Adv. Chem. Phys. **77**, 287 (1987).
- [163] M. Dolg, in *Modern Methods and Algorithms of Quantum Chemistry*, edited by J. Grotendorst (John von Neumann Institute for Computing, 2000), vol. 1, pp. 479–508.
- [164] C. W. Greeff and W. A. Lester, Jr., J. Chem. Phys. **109**, 1607 (1998).

- [165] H.-J. Flad, F. Schautz, Y. Wang, and M. Dolg, in *Recent Advances in Quantum Monte Carlo Methods, Part II*, edited by S. M. Rothstein, W. A. Lester, Jr., and S. Tanaka (World Scientific, Singapore, 2002).
- [166] S. A. Alexander, R. L. Coldwell, G. Aissing, and A. J. Thakkar, *Int. J. Q. Chem.* **26**, 213 (1992).
- [167] K. S. Liu, M. H. Kalos, and G. V. Chester, *Phys. Rev. A* **10**, 303 (1974).
- [168] R. N. Barnett, P. J. Reynolds, and W. A. Lester, Jr., *J. Comp. Phys.* **96**, 258 (1991).
- [169] P. J. Reynolds, R. N. Barnett, B. L. Hammond, R. M. Grimes, and W. A. Lester, Jr., *Int. J. of Quant. Chem.* **29**, 589 (1986).
- [170] A. L. L. East, S. M. Rothstein, and J. Vrbik, *J. Chem. Phys.* **89**, 4880 (1988).
- [171] P. Langfelder, S.M. Rothstein, and J. Vrbik, *J. Chem. Phys.* **107**, 8525 (97).
- [172] M. Honik, M. Snajdr, and S. M. Rothstein, *J. Chem. Phjys.* **113**, 3496 (2000).
- [173] F. Schautz and H.-J. Flad, *J. Chem. Phys.* **110**, 11700 (1999).
- [174] R. N. Barnett, P. J. Reynolds, and W. A. Lester, Jr., *J. Chem. Phys.* **96**, 2141 (1992).
- [175] R. N. Barnett, P. J. Reynolds, and W. A. Lester, Jr., *Int. J. of Quant. Chem.* **42**, 837 (1992).
- [176] S. W. Zhang and M. H. Kalos, *J. Stat. Phys.* **70**, 515 (1993).
- [177] D. M. Ceperley and B. Bernu, *J. Chem. Phys.* **89**, 6316 (1988).
- [178] M. Born and J. R. Oppenheimer, *Ann. Phys.* **84**, 457 (1927).
- [179] C. A. Traynor, J. B. Anderson, and B. M. Boghosian, *J. Chem. Phys.* **94**, 3657 (1994).
- [180] R. G. Parr and W. Yang, *Density Functional Theory of Atoms and Molecules* (Oxford University Press, 1989).
- [181] C. Filippi and C. J. Umrigar, in *Recent Advances in Quantum Monte Carlo Methods, Part II*, edited by S. M. Rothstein, W. A. Lester, Jr., and S. Tanaka (World Scientific, Singapore, 2002).
- [182] Z. Sun, W. A. Lester, Jr., and B. L. Hammond, *J. Chem. Phys.* **97**, 7585 (1992).
- [183] J. Vrbik, D. A. Lagare, and S. M. Rothstein, *J. Chem. Phys.* **92**, 1221 (1990).
- [184] J. Vrbik and S. M. Rothstein, *J. Chem. Phys.* **96**, 2071 (1992).

- [185] P. Belohorec, S.M. Rothstein, and J. Vrbik, J. Chem. Phys. **98**, 6401 (1993).
- [186] C. J. Umrigar, Int. J. of Quant. Chem. **23**, 217 (1989).
- [187] K. C. Huang, R. J. Needs, and G. Rajagopal, J. Chem. Phys. **112**, 4419 (2000).
- [188] F. Schautz and H.-J. Flad, J. Chem. Phys. **112**, 4421 (2000).
- [189] R. Car and M. Parinello, Phys. Rev. Lett. **55**, 2471 (1985).
- [190] S. Tanaka, J. Chem. Phys. **100**, 7416 (1994).
- [191] S. Tanaka, in *Recent Advances in Quantum Monte Carlo Methods, Part II*, edited by S. M. Rothstein, W. A. Lester, Jr., and S. Tanaka (World Scientific, Singapore, 2002).
- [192] J. Boronat and J. Casulleras, Comp. Phys. Comm. **122**, 466 (1999).

Part V

List of symbols

We denote:

Z_j Atomic nuclear charge,

$\mathcal{R}$ Set of coordinates of clamped particles (under the Born-Oppenheimer approximation): $\mathcal{R} \equiv \{\mathcal{R}_1, \dots, \mathcal{R}_m\}$,

r_i Electronic coordinate in a Cartesian frame $r_i = \{x_i \dots x_d\}$, where the number of dimensions, d is 3 for most chemical applications,

$\mathbf{R}$ Set of coordinates of all n particles treated by QMC, $\mathbf{R} \equiv \{r_1, \dots, r_n\}$,

σ_i Spin coordinate for an electron, $\sigma_{\uparrow}$ is spin-up and $\sigma_{\downarrow}$ for spin-down particles,

Σ Set of spin coordinates for particles, $\Sigma \equiv \{\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_N\}$,

Ψ_o Exact ground state wave function,

Ψ_i *ith.* exact wave function,

$\Psi_{T,i}$ Approximate trial wave function for state i ,

ϕ_k Single particle molecular orbital (MO),

$D(\phi_k)$ Slater determinant of k MOs: $D = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N!}} \det |\phi_1, \dots, \phi_N|$,

$D^{\uparrow}(\phi_k^{\uparrow}), D^{\downarrow}(\phi_k^{\downarrow})$, Spin factored Slater determinants for spin up ($\uparrow$) and spin down ($\downarrow$) electrons,

$\hat{H}$ Hamiltonian operator: $\hat{H} \equiv \hat{T} + \hat{V}$,
 $\hat{T}$ Kinetic energy operator $-\frac{1}{2}\nabla_R^2 \equiv -\frac{1}{2}\sum_i \nabla_i^2$,
 $\hat{V}$ Potential energy operator, for atomic and molecular systems: $\hat{V} = -\sum_{ij} \frac{Z_i}{r_{ij}} + \sum_{i<j} \frac{1}{r_{ij}} + \sum_{i<j} \frac{Z_i Z_j}{r_{ij}}$,
 τ Imaginary time, $\tau = it$,
 $\rho(\mathbf{r})$ Electronic density,
 E_L Local Energy, $\hat{H}\Psi_T(\mathbf{R})/\Psi_T(\mathbf{R})$,
 $\mathcal{U}_{[a,b]}$ Uniform random variate in the interval $[a, b]$,
 $\mathcal{G}_\sigma$ Gaussian random variate of variance σ ,
 $\sigma_{\hat{O}}$ Monte Carlo variance for observable $\hat{O}$
 $\mathcal{W}$ Ensemble of random walkers, $\mathcal{W} \equiv \{\mathbf{R}_1, \mathbf{R}_2, \dots, \mathbf{R}_n\}$,
 $\mathcal{P}(\mathbf{R})$ Monte Carlo probability density function,
 $P(\mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}')$ Monte Carlo transition probability,
 $B(\mathbf{R}, \mathbf{R}')$ Branching factor for Population Monte Carlo algorithms.
 $G(\mathbf{R}, \mathbf{R}'; \tau - \tau')$ Time dependent Green's function,
 $G_{ST}(\mathbf{R}, \mathbf{R}'; \delta\tau)$ Time dependent short time Green's function for the Schrödinger equation
 $\mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{q}}$ Quantum force, $\mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{q}} \equiv \nabla \ln |\Psi_T(\mathbf{R})^2|$,
 $\mathcal{D}$ Denominator in Fermion Monte Carlo, $\mathcal{D} \equiv \sum_{i=1}^{Nw} [\frac{\psi_T(R_i^+)}{\Psi_G^+(R_i^+)} \frac{\psi_T(R_i^-)}{\Psi_G^-(R_i^-)}]$
 M_I Ionic mass,
 μ_α Fictitious parameter mass.